

# **INSIGHTS**

## **INTO**

# **ISLAMIC THOUGHT**

### **PART - I**

**Sayyid Abul A'la Maududi**

*Translated by*  
**Dr. Mohd. Riaz Kirmani**

## Contents

	Foreword	5
1	Judgment of Reason	7
2	Short –Sightedness	17
3	Secret of Guidance and Misguidance	25
4	Islam a Religion of Knowledge and Reason	33
5	Concept of Ibadah in Islam	47
6	<i>Jihad</i> in the Way of Allah	75
7	Islamic Concept of Freedom	99
8	Liberalism	115
9	True Meaning of Islamic Nationality	127
10	More about Islamic Nationality	141
11	Enjoining the Right and Forbidding the Wrong	147
12	God's Law of Punishment	157
13	Some Questions of a Christian Scholar	167
14	Is the Word of Unity Enough for Salvation?	179
15	Is it Necessary to Believe in Prophecy?	193
16	Belief in Prophecy	209
17	Greatest Blame on the Quran	225
18	Rational Proof of Mohammed's Prophet-hood	247
19	Following and Obedience of the Prophet	265
20	Personal and Prophetic Capacity of a Messenger	285

21	Prophet-hood and the Related Instructions	294
22	<i>Hadith</i> and the Quran	331
23	Balanced Way	363
24	Some Questions about the <i>Hadith</i>	383
25	The Quran and the <i>Sunnah</i> of the Prophet	392
26	Objections to a <i>Hadith</i> , and their Solution	399



## Foreword

(First Publication)

A collection of my essays has been published before under the title '*Tanqueehat*': That consisted of discussions related to the purification of minds from those intricacies which developed as a result of the modern western thoughts and activities. Now, the present collection contains essays of different type. In these essays those important problems of Islam have been explicated and clarified about which misunderstandings have spread. Hence the name '*Tafheemat*' has been given to these collections. The number of these essays proved to be far more than expected in the beginning. That is why they had to be divided into four parts, though initially I assessed that the work will consume only one volume.

Abul A'la

30th Muharram 1359 A.H.  
March 1940 A.C.



## Translator's Note

Dear Readers,

This is second attempt of translating the scholarly work of a great man of twentieth century known worldwide. *Maulana* Abul A'la Moududi's work is generally casted as political Islam. But as his book "*Tanquihaat*" (تنقیحات) translated before by the title "*Perceptions*", this piece of work titled as "*Tafheemaat*" Part I (تفهیمات حصہ اول) in Urdu now in your hands in English also clearly shows that the honourable *Maulana* comprehended all the aspects of Islam and had the capacity of successfully dealing with the most burning issues of his time and removing the doubts of modern minds. His scholarly and practical zeal influenced the twentieth century minds to stand firm for a change in attitude which is being observed in 21<sup>st</sup> century as well. I consider this translation work as an honour to myself, and if you pray for me it may be acceptable in the presence of the Almighty.

*Ayaat* of the Holy Quran quoted separately in this issue have been translated according to Abdullah Yusuf Ali, while those in the running text and also the *hadiths* of the beloved prophet (SAW) are translated by me. Urdu title "*Tafheemaat*" (تفهیمات) is in four parts. I have taken the responsibility of translation project only in expectation of the support of Almighty Allah. But in the light of deteriorating health I request your special prayers for the accomplishment of the project. Allah may help us (آمین).

**Dr. Mohd. Riaz Kirmani**

## Judgment of Reason

We see in big cities hundreds of industries on work, the trains and trams run by the power of electricity. Thousands of bulbs suddenly glow in the evening. Fans move in every home during summer. But we neither feel any wonder and astonishment on these events, nor have any difference of opinion about the cause of glow or motion of these things. Why? Because we see with our own eyes those wires to which these bulbs are connected. We also know the fact that the wires are connected to the electric station. We are also aware about the existence of those people who work in that station and the engineer who looks after the workers. We are acquainted with the fact that the engineer knows about the process of making electricity; he has many instruments which he moves and creates the power whose effects we see in glowing of bulbs, movement of fans, running of trains, trams, flour mills and many industries. Hence, after looking at the signs of electricity, the only reason of the absence of differences among us about the causes of these signs is that the complete link of these causes is within the range of our senses and we have observed the links.

Suppose all this happened; bulbs lighted, fans moved, trains and trams ran, flour mills and machines worked but the wires which bring current to them were not in our observation, the electric stations were also out of the range of our senses, we were also not knowing about the workers in the electric stations, not also aware that an engineer is there in the power station who is running it by his knowledge and control. Were then also, our hearts equally satisfied by looking at these signs of electricity? Had we not differed in the causes of these phenomena in

this situation too? Obviously your answer will be in negative. Why?---It is because when the causes of phenomena are hidden, the reasons of appearances are not known, the presence of wonder with dissatisfaction in hearts, engagement of minds in discovering the hidden secret and the difference of opinion about the secret is quite natural.

Now, extend the discourse on the line of the above supposition. Assume that whatever has been supposed is a fact. Thousands of bulbs are lighting, millions of fans are moving, trains are running, mills are in action but we have no means to know which power is on work and wherefrom does it come. People seeing them are surprised and awe inspired. Everybody is consuming his reason to know its causes. Somebody says all these things are glowing or moving by themselves, nothing is there outside to give them light or motion. Some other person says the arrangement of material they are made of gives them light or motion. Other people say that there are gods outside the material world, one of them lights the bulbs, the other runs the train and tram, some other one moves the fans while the one is the mover of mills and industries. Some people tired of long thinking have started saying that our reason cannot find the secret of this magic, we only know what we see and sense, we do not understand more than that, and we can neither confirm nor refute what we do not understand.

All these groups fight each other, but they have no source of knowledge in their favour or refutation of others except suppositions, opinions and assessments.

Amidst these differences a person comes and says: "Brothers! I have a source of knowledge that you do not have. Through this source I have come to know that all these bulbs, fans, trains, machines and mills are connected

to certain hidden wires which you do not sense. These wires are connected to a very big electric station equipped with grand machines run by large number of people. All these people follow the commands of a great engineer who has established this system with fine knowledge and strong grip. All these activities are being done under his guidance and supervision.

This person puts his claim with full strength. People refute him, all groups join together and differ to him, declare him insane, beat and hurt, and exile him, yet he firmly sticks to his claim despite all spiritual and physical calamities. He does not bring about even a minor change in his claim because of terror or greed. No calamity weakens him in his claim. His every action shows that he is perfectly certain to the truth of his contention.

Another person comes after him. He also says exactly the same thing with the same vigour. Then the third, fourth and fifth person comes; each one repeats the words of his predecessor. After that the people start coming in chain so that their count exceeds hundreds and thousands, every one repeating the same words with the same vigour. They do not differ despite the difference of time, space and conditions. All of them claim that they have a source of knowledge the common people do not have. All of them are declared insane, targeted cruelly and harshly, compelled by all means to differ from their words, but all keep strict to their words. No power of the world could deflect them even an inch from their stand. With this firmness and strength they have some other prominent qualities too. None of them is a liar, thief, trust unworthy, evil doer, and tyrant and corrupt (*haram khour*); even their enemies accept this fact. Their morals are pure, characters highly pious, prominent from others in good manners. Moreover, no sign of insanity is found in them,

but in contrast, they have presented to the world such teachings, rules and laws for the discipline of manners, purification of self (*nafs*), reformation of world affairs that the presentation of the like example is a far goal, even great scholars and wise people have to consume their lives in understanding their subtleties.

Now, there are on one side the refuters of varying opinions and on the other side are the united claimants. The case of both is submitted to the judiciary of sound reason. It is the duty of reason as a judge that it should first of all decide about its own position, the position of both claimants, and then it should decide after comparing both, which of the view is sound and acceptable.

The actual position of the judge is that he has in fact no means of knowing about the truth of the matter. He himself has no knowledge of the truth. He has with him only the sayings of the two groups, their arguments, information about their selves, and external signs and indicators. He has to look on these and decide whose truth is most probable. He can also not give a verdict more than the status of probability because he cannot know about the truth on the basis of the material present on record (*mithl*). He can tilt towards any one of the opponents but can refute or confirm none with surety and certainty.

### Position of Refuters

- 1 Their opinions about the truth are different, no unity in any of the points so far so that sometimes there is a difference of opinion among the members of the same group.
- 2 They accept that they have no source of knowledge that is not available to others. None of them claims more than that their opinions are stronger than the

others. But everyone accepts that their opinions are only opinions.

- 3 Their belief on their opinions has not gained the status of faith, certainty and infallible surety. Examples of changing their views are common among them. It has been often experienced that a person who was expressing his views vigorously day before, he refuted his own theory today and presented another theory. Their theories change with the growth of age, intellect, knowledge and experience.
- 4 They have only one argument against the claimants that they have not presented any proof of their truth. They have shown us those hidden wires which according to them are connected to the bulbs and fans etc. They did not prove the presence of electricity by demonstration, not showed us the electric station, not put to our examination the machines at work there. Also, they did not introduce the engineer to us. Then how can we suppose that all these things are truly present?

### **Position of Claimants**

- 1 They are united in their claim. They are perfectly united in all the fundamental points of their assertions.
- 2 All of them say that they have a special source of knowledge that the others do not have.
- 3 None of them has said that they are talking on the basis of opinion but everybody has said that they have special relations with the engineer. His workers come to us. He has also shown us his worksite and whatever we say is based on

knowledge and certainty not on opinion and assessment.

- 4 There is no example of even minute change of opinion by any one of them. Everybody has been saying just the same thing from the first day of his claim till last breath.
- 5 They present purest character, no trace of lie, cheating and deception. People who are true and pure in all matters of life, why should they all together speak lie in this particular matter? Is it understandable?
- 6 Also, there is no proof that they had some personal benefit behind this claim. Contrast to it, most of them had to face great calamities, bodily tortured, imprisoned, beaten and exiled because of this claim. Some of them were brutally slaughtered, their bodies were split apart by saw and except few, and none of them could pass healthy and wealthy life. Thus none of them can be accused of selfishness. Contrary to it their firmness on their stand despite such difficult tests proves their top certainty on the truth of their claim, a certainty that did not allow them change their view even to save their lives.
- 7 There is no proof that they are under the influence of evil spirits or insane. All of them have been found very wise and sound of reason in all matters of life. Often their opponents have accepted the vigour of their intellect. Then, how can it be supposed that in this particular matter they were caught by the evil spirits? The matter too, so important that became a question of life and death, for which they had to restrain and fight against the entire world for years; that was the fundamental

principle of their intellectual teachings (whose reasonability is acceptable to many opponents also).

- 8 They did not say that they could arrange meeting between you and the engineer or his workers, or show you his hidden work site, or could prove their claim by observation or experiment. They themselves relate all these matters to the unseen but ask you to keep confidence on them and accept what they say.

After listening to the view point and arguments of the two opponent groups, the judiciary of reason gives its verdict.

She says both the groups have searched for the hidden causes of few signs and phenomena and each has produced its own theories. On the face value all the theories are equal in the sense that, 1) None of them can be analysed by reason i.e. following the rules of reason it cannot be said about any theory that its truth is impossible. 2) Truth of none can be proved by experiment or observation. Neither any one of the first group can give scientific proof of its theories compelling each to accept, nor the second group is capable of doing so and also does not claim it. But after thinking on the matter more deeply some important points come into light on the basis of which the theory of the second group is more agreeable.

- 1 No other theory has been unanimously claimed and confirmed by such an enormous number of wise, pious and true people with such strength, certainty and faith.
- 2 Unanimity of a great number of pious persons belonging to different periods and places in the claim that they have an extraordinary source of knowledge and that they have known the inner



causes of these apparent phenomena compels us to approve their claim, especially because their saying are not contradictory. Moreover, their claims are not irrational, nor it can be rationally claimed that it is impossible that some people may have extraordinary powers, not commonly available to other people.

- 3 If we concentrate on the conditions of the objective phenomena it seems more probable that the theory of the second group of proponents should be correct as the bulbs, fans, trains and industries do not glow and move by themselves because in this situation their glow and motion would have been according to their own will, and the fact is not that. Their light and motion is also not because of the arrangement of their body matter, because when they do not lit and move, the arrangement still remains the same. Their control by separate powers is also not correct because sometimes all of them suddenly stand still. Thus the theories presented by the first group for explaining the objective phenomena are far away from reason and analogy; it seems more profound that one single power should be working behind these phenomena and this power should be controlled by a wise and powerful hand which should be using this power in different phenomena according to a system.

As far as the opinion of sceptics ----- that the matter is not understandable to us and whatever we do not understand we neither deny nor confirm it ----- is concerned, the rule of reason does not consider this also correct because the occurrence of an event does not necessarily require that it should also be understood by the listeners. Believable and continuous witness is enough to

accept the factual happening. If some reasonable persons tell us that in west they have seen flying in the air in vehicles made of metal and we have come back here after listening to the American song while sitting at London, we shall only try to know if they are liars or do they joke? Do they have any personal purpose behind it? Are they mentally impaired? If it is proved that they are neither liars, nor jokers, nor their personal purpose is associated with this, and if we found that many true and wise people are repeating it with perfect sincerity and without contradiction, we shall certainly accept it even if we cannot comprehend by any means the possibility of the flight of a man in metallic vehicles and listening to a song without any visible medium at a distance of thousand miles.

This is the judgment of reason in this matter. But the stage of surety and certainty, which is termed as faith (*iman*), does not come into being by this. It requires intuition. For this it is necessary that an inner voice should finish all types of refutations, doubts, hesitations and clearly say that the opinions of people are false; truth is that which has been told by true people not out of opinion but through knowledge and insight.

*Tarjumanul Quran, Rajab, 1352 A.H.; December, 1933 A.C.*

## Short Sightedness

A handsome child of one or two years was suffering from fever and colic. Strongest person could not tolerate seeing his pain and restlessness. Sometimes he looked towards his parents for relief and sometimes opened his little mouth before the doctor to drink bitter and sour medicines. He left his parents for ever after passing one day and night in throbbing pain. Seeing his restlessness and the ailing sight of death, a question just appears in heart. Why the kind and merciful God who is the source of affection and love ensues difficulties and pains on little innocent babies though He Himself says, 'I am not tyrant to the servants'? (ما انا بظلام للعبيد 50:29).

Above is the portion of a friend's letter. The question arisen in his mind is what generally appears in the minds of people whenever they observe death, ailment and calamities. Death of thousands of people in helpless condition during epidemics, destruction of thousands of houses at the time of earth-quake, uncountable calamities of people during storm, writhing of people out of great pain and hurt in different spoiling diseases----in nut shell every sight of calamity, pain and injury----- naturally causes in the heart of every man a question i.e. God Who is loving and merciful, Who is proud of His Lordship, Grace and Benevolence, Who Himself claims that He is not a tyrant, why such a God inflicts hardships to His slaves? What for does He test by hardships His creatures while He Himself has provided them the sense of pain? Some people on this question go to the extent that they

consider these signs of fury against the love and mercy of God and begin to think (may Allah save us) that God is a blind force, not knowing about the injuries and pains of any one; He is busy, in vain, in creating and breaking without any knowledge.

Those who have given thought to the world order and the system of the earth and the sky have come to the belief that the world does not consist of separate and self sustained existences. But it is a whole having all its parts harmonized together. A particle of earth is associated with the particles of mars and mercury just like a hair of my head is connected to the hair of my arm. It means that the world is a single body and its parts are associated just like the organs of a body. Moreover, the way the parts of the world are associated its events are also connected together. Big or small event of the world is not a separate and individual happening, but it is a link of the chain of events which occur according to the total requirements. Keeping in view of this, God is running the entire limitless world. Now, the considerable aspect to think is that a man who does not view the whole world but looks only a very little part having ratio with the whole even lesser than that of a particle with the sun, and one who has no complete picture of world events, and who has before him only one two or some out of the limitless and countless links, and the one who is seeing only the apparent aspects of this little number of known links and has no means of knowing the deeper realities; whether such a man can be considered capable of making some opinion about the comprehensive expedience of a particular event? And would he be right, if he dares to maintain any opinion?

System of the world and the Godhead of God is so vast that our minds are tired of thinking about it. Consider, on

a lesser scale, about the kingdom of a man. A man who is sitting on the chair of a minister or on the throne and is looking after the order of a kingdom is, though, like ourselves in being a man without much difference as far as the natural capability is concerned, none of his affairs is such that we could not understand or undertake, yet only one difference that he is sitting on the chair and looking on the matters of administration while we are sitting in a corner unattached to the administration make such a great difference between him and us that we cannot factually understand his activities. We are not able to understand the cause or expedience when any affair comes into our knowledge. Now, if such a big difference occurs between human beings only because of position, one can guess what a grand difference should there be between man and God, while in this case there not a difference of position but it is that of the grand reality. He is commanding over the whole world and we are sitting in one of its little corner. His knowledge and observation comprehends the entire universe and our knowledge and observation does not cover even the inner facts of our own body. He is Omnipotent and we are powerless. If even with such a great difference we criticize His works and give opinion about His wisdom and expedience, would this criticism not be billion times more ignorant than the criticism on the matters of kingdom by a villager sitting in his hut.

Another example is even more clear and explicit. Suppose you are a gardener. Surely, you must love the trees, plants and vases of the garden you have grown and in whose nourishment and decoration you have utilized your whole energy and skill. You will not overlook the tiniest thing important for its security. You will never like to cut and trim them uselessly. And you will become highly angry if an external person comes and injures

them. Moreover, you know by different methods of knowledge that the plants feel rest and pain, sorrow and pleasure and you know that the plants and trees also sense pain of injury by an axe or scissors and that they feel pain of amputation of their organs separation of their children (fruits). But despite this knowledge and love you use the cut and trim method according to the requirement and the total expedience of your garden, you amputate the leaves and branches. You graft the plants after cutting differently, give shape by trimming the greenery, pluck the unripe or ripe fruits as required, and also the unopened and open flowers, dig out unnecessary plants, cut and throw the dry trees.

All this activity is injustice from top to bottom if looked at from the view point of the trees, plants, creepers and flowers. Were they equipped with the power of speech they would have said, "What kind of unkindly and tyrannical person this gardener is. It cuts and trims our organs, snatches away our children and digs out small plants which have not tested even one sprig in their life. Plucks little buds, differentiates not between old, young and the children, its work is only to cut. And, sometimes this tyrant person uses a machine in such a way that it clears thousands of our family once for all. Can such a person be called sympathetic and merciful? Can there be in his heart the pure sentiments of love, mercy and kindness? We do not find any expediency in this cut and trim, dig and fall. He seems to us to be a blind, senseless and tyrannical person who without any knowledge, wisdom, aim and objective sometimes gives us water and other times use scissors, sometime supplies us with fertilizer and other times cuts us with axe and throws us away. Sometimes he protects us from others, while other times he digs out and throws us with his own hands.

Sometimes he helps us in disease while other times, kills us all at once by a machine.

What will you say if the trees criticize you? Only that their sight is short and limited, they could see only their neighbouring links, but my view is vast and I see the total welfare of the garden. They are interested only in their fruits, flowers, leaves and branches; at the most they develop relations of love and sympathy with the nearest plants and the trees. But in my view is the betterment of the entire garden and I am acting for the welfare of all together. Every ignorant tree and foolish plant considers that the garden has been arranged for its self, friends and kin, and its own benefit is considerable in the garden, but in fact I have grown them for the garden. Whatever little or more interest I have in them is for the garden itself, and I protect and nourish each and every tree, plant and vine to the extent that is good and necessary for the garden as a whole. But when the requirements of the entire garden compel, I do every thing, cut and trim, scratch and slash, dig and throw because the benefit of the entire garden is more precious in my view than the benefit of individual tree, plant or vine. They consider that I practice upon them with animosity but it is their ignorance and narrow mindedness. They are not capable of understanding the affairs and the expedencies of the garden as such. They sense only their pain and have wishes of their own comfort and life. When there is some shock to their wishes and feelings, they loose patience and suspect me to be tyrant. But the truth does not follow their suspicion. I cannot be factually a tyrant because of their understanding and also, I cannot change the administration of my garden for them.

You will get the answer of most of your complaints and objections when you will keep before you an expanded view of this little example.

When we think on the system of this world we come to know that the One Who runs this great universe must be extremely wise, intelligent, knowledgeable and informed. It is not possible that one who has created wishes in us should not know the wishes, it is impossible that one who has created senses in us should be unaware of our senses. One who has created the child and instilled love in the heart of her parents for her nourishment must know about the pain of disease and death to the child and the shock that the parents feel. But if despite knowing all this more than us He agreed to inflict this pain to the child and the parents, despite knowing about our feeling He agreed to crush them, despite knowing about our wishes He refused to fulfill them, we should understand that it must have been surely necessary and there would have been no better option in the knowledge of the Intelligent One. Otherwise He would have chosen the same better course, because He is wise and one cannot suspect about the Wise that He will use a bad device in presence of a good one. No doubt that we do not and cannot understand His wisdom because we do not look complete order of the world and we cannot know what its expediencies are and when what devices are necessary for them? But if we correctly believe in nut shell in the wisdom and intelligence of Allah and His perfect knowledge, we shall understand at every trouble that Allah's wisdom demanded the same, and it was the best in His knowledge, and we have no way but to agree and be pleased.

Moreover, the other thing that we come to know after thinking is that, the One who is running the system of the world has a holistic view of welfare before Him. The



vices and distortions that we see in His works are in fact relative, i.e. they can be called vices in relation to individuals. But in fact they are virtues as whole and their existence is unavoidable for all comprehensive well being. If these vices were not unnecessary and all comprehensive virtues could be obtained without them, the wise and knowledgeable Allah would have not used them and had chosen some other system. When we ourselves despite all weaknesses look in depth, our intellect admits that a better system was not possible for this world. No other system free of these partial and relative vices can be suggested. Instead, if these vices do not occur, then their absence will actually be a greater vice because it will check many inlets of welfare. Take for example the death about which man cries the most. The death of one person makes way for the life of how many people? If one person is given the license of life, it means that the door of life has been closed for many. His permanent life is a virtue only for himself. But it is a wreath for the well being as a whole. In contrast to it the death of that particular person is a partial vice only for him, but the same vice is a source of many partial virtues. As for the comprehensive virtue, there is no loss to it for the death of a person, because there is no disturbance in world order because of his death.

In the light of the above example you can understand by analogy that whatever discomforts are inflicted upon the people are all vices from one angle and the source of welfare from the other, and their presence is necessary for the all comprehensive welfare. Some times we are able to understand after a little thought the reason of its being the source of good, and some time the experience tells us that the thing which we considered bad was in fact good. Even if in certain case we are not able to understand the good side of a bad thing we should believe in general that Allah

## Secret of Guidance and Misguidance

Some time ago the opinions of Mr. George Bernard Shaw were published in certain journals. When he travelled the East the correspondent of a journal entitled "*Al Huda*" of Singapore met him and during his talk with him he repeated the same ideas and accepted the virtues of Islam. He said that Islam is a religion of freedom and legal and mental liberty. Christianity cannot be compared to it from the point of view of the collective social system. Collective social system of any religion is not as perfect as it is the system of Islam. Fall of the Islamic world is because of its distance from Islam itself. When Muslims will work hard for Islam, the slumber of Islam will turn into awakening.

After listening to these views, the correspondent asked, "Why don't you declare yourself a Muslim if you consider Islam as good? This type of question naturally appears in mind after such statements, because there should be no gap for a naturally sound person between knowing about the vices of a system and giving it up, and then accepting another system as soon as he becomes aware of its virtues. But the answer of Mr. Shaw shows that he is not ready to accept Islam, and for this he has no reason except the dearth of a quality known as the space in heart (*Sharh-e- Sadr*).

This situation is not confined to Mr. Shaw, there are many thinkers who have observed this before, and there are many others today who have recognized the virtues of Islam, accepted the worldly and religious benefits of the religion, recognized the greatness of its culture, its collective system, knowledge truth and its practical power, but when the question of accepting, believing and

entering its fold was put to them, something tied their feet and they stopped at the boundary of Islam.

In contrast to it there have been such people also who passed most of their life in the enmity of Islam but after adequate study the truth of Islam revealed to them whereby no power could stop them accepting the faith.

Truth is that the secret of guidance and misguidance is a strange secret. Same message is given thousands of people, but a person does not attend to it, the other one attends but it just passes away after striking to his ears, a person listens to it and understands also but does not accept. Someone appreciates and praises but does not accept and confirm it while in the other's heart it settles and he believes in its truth and joins faith.

We observe day and night that hundreds of people look a person who falls in the market after injury. Many of them think it an ordinary event and pass just after a glance on it. The hearts of many feel mercy but they also step ahead after expressing sympathy. Many of them stay there only to look the game. And some servants of Allah step forward, help him rise, show him sympathy and try to help him. Many people see a criminal going in chains but without paying attention, any person looks at him hatefully, the other shows sympathy, the third one laughs at him, fourth one expresses joy on his end. Some other says he got what he did. Some one takes lesson from his end with a desire to keep away from the crime.

These are the personal psychological feelings of different people whose difference is not more surprising. More wondering than this is that a single person's feeling and the influence of a thing on him at different times varies. A person listens to a thing thousand times but once all of a sudden the barriers on his heart are breached all of a sudden and the message which had remained confined to

the ear drum now enters direct in the heart. He himself wonders that he had listened to it severally before but what has happened today that it is piercing direct into the heart? A person often sees people in ruin but without any attention while at a good time the heart of the same person fills with sorrow as soon as he looks any body in difficulty and the screen of hardness dissolves, and he become most sympathetic, merciful and soft hearted. A person gets many chances in life to see the events full of advice, but looks at them as game, sometimes with regret and sorrow and sometimes an ordinary look effects him in such a way that it leaves a permanent mark on his heart.

The same is the nature of guidance and misguidance. It was the same Quran, its same teaching, and the same tongue was preaching it. Abu Jahl and Abu Lahab continued listening to it for the entire life but it did not go ahead of their ears. Khadijtu Kubra (RA), Abu Bakr (RA) and Ali bin abi Talib (RA) listened to it and within moments they entered the boundaries of faith without a tint of doubt in their heart. Omar Ibn al-Khattab had listened to it severally and not only that he did not accept but every time he listened he became harder and harder in enmity. But the same ears listened to it at a fortunate moment and all the strong barriers between the ears and the heart suddenly razed to ground and changed his life all together.

Even though many correct reasons can be presented from psychological point of view for this difference of nature and effects. But one cannot deny that something that remains working as a curtain between eyes and ears on one hand and the heart and mind on the other, and which at certain psychological point is chalked out itself and does not become a barrier at all while in some cases it becomes selective, is not under the intention and

discretion of man, but is quite natural and instinctive and appears in man itself.

The same point has been discussed in the Quran as follows:

فَمَنْ يُرِدِ اللَّهُ أَنْ يَهْدِيَهُ يَشْرَحْ صَدْرَهُ لِلْإِسْلَامِ وَمَنْ يُرِدْ  
أَنْ يُضِلَّهُ يَجْعَلْ صَدْرَهُ ضَيِّقًا حَرَجًا كَأَنَّمَا يَصْعَدُ فِي  
السَّمَاءِ كَذَلِكَ يَجْعَلُ اللَّهُ الرِّجْسَ عَلَى الَّذِينَ  
لَا يُؤْمِنُونَ (الأنعام: ١٢٥)

*Those whom He willeth to guide, ---He openeth their breast to Islam; those whom He willeth to leave straying,--- He maketh their breast close and constricted, as they had to climb up to the sky: thus doth Allah lay abomination on those who refuse to believe.*

(Al-An'am: 125)

At another place the same thing has been said as follows:

وَلَوْ شَاءَ اللَّهُ لَجَعَلَكُمْ أُمَّةً وَاحِدَةً وَلَكِنْ يُضِلُّ مَنْ يَشَاءُ وَ  
يَهْدِي مَنْ يَشَاءُ (النحل: ٩٣)

*If Allah so willed, He could make you all one people: but He leave straying whom he pleases, and He guides whom He pleases....*

(Al-Nahl: 93)

قُلْ إِنْ أَرَادَ اللَّهُ يُضِلُّ مَنْ يَشَاءُ وَيَهْدِي إِلَيْهِ مَنْ أَرَادَ

(الرعد: ٢٤)

*Say: Truly Allah leaveth to stray whom He will; but He guideth to Himself those who turn to him in penitence*

(Al Ra'd: 27)

وَإِذَا قَرَأْتَ الْقُرْآنَ جَعَلْنَا بَيْنَكَ وَبَيْنَ الَّذِينَ لَا يُؤْمِنُونَ  
بِالْآخِرَةِ حِجَابًا مَسْتُورًا وَجَعَلْنَا عَلَى قُلُوبِهِمْ أَكِنَّةً أَنْ  
يَفْقَهُوهُ وَفِي آذَانِهِمْ وَقْرًا (نبي: ١٧)

(نبي: ١٧)

*"When thou dost recite the Quran, We put, between thee and those who believe not in the hereafter, a veil invisible. And We put covering over their hearts (and*

*minds) lest they should understand the Quran, and deafness unto their ears."* (Bani Israel: 45, 46)

In these *Ayaat*, that natural situation which suddenly appears in heart to accept something just on hearing it and finally pulls towards belief has been termed as the guidance of God, and for instilling guidance the term 'opening of heart' (*sharh sadr*) has been used. Contrast to this guidance, the situation that occurs in man's heart to reject and turn away from the truth has been termed as God given misguidance. And compared to the 'opening of heart' (*sharh sadr*), the constriction in the heart against guidance has been termed as 'narrowing of heart' (*daiq sadr*). Then the cause of this guidance and misguidance or 'opening' and 'narrowing' of heart has been told as follows. When a man once pays attention to God, the way of God itself begins to open before him. Contrast to it if a person does not have any sense of standing before God and giving the account of his heart and limbs, nothing enters to his heart even if any body calls words of truth before him, preaches and advises him severally.

Here again two things are combined together, which if understood separately, the problem of this theme discussed in various ways at different places in the Quran is very easily solved.

On one side the guidance and opening of heart, and misguidance and narrowing of heart has been related to God and on the other side the first two (guidance and opening of heart) have been conditioned by attention of the man towards God, and the cause of the last two (misguidance and narrowing of heart) has been told as inattention to God and no feeling of accountability.

Try to understand the connection between the two as follows. Allah has instilled in the nature of man a power which helps him differentiate between the true and false and the right and wrong and also tilts him to step towards

truth and keep away from false. It is this power that is the natural guidance and which Allah relates to Himself as follows:

فِطْرَةَ اللَّهِ الَّتِي فَطَرَ النَّاسَ عَلَيْهَا (روم: ٣٠)

*The nature in which Allah has made mankind:*

(Al Rome: 30)

In contrast to this, another power is also at work in man which pulls him towards vice, tilts toward mistakes and wrong steps, and adores before him what is wrong and false. More than these two, there are many internal and external powers some of which support the power of guidance and others support the power of misguidance. Attaining to knowledge, different levels and qualities of practice, society and its various conditions influence from outside and add to any one pan of the balance. Human power of discretion, understanding, reason, vision, making wrong or right use of his knowledge sources, correct or incorrect application of his judgment are the things under his intention which he uses in selecting between the contrasting powers of guidance and misguidance.

Now it so happens that the God's ordained guidance and His misguidance, both continue working together. Power of guidance gives him fine signals towards the right path and the power of misguidance lures him towards decorated falsehood. But sometimes, influenced by wrong things and wrongly using his intention, the man is caught in the net of misguidance and does not give any heed to the call of guidance. Sometimes it so happens that a man is walking in wrong direction, but some external influences and his own intellect and vision repel him from the misguidance. It is the time when the same dim light of guidance becomes suddenly strong and opens his eyes. Some times it so happens that the man remains suspended

between guidance and misguidance; goes here and there, the power of decision is not so strong that he may take a definite position. Some of the unfortunate people leave this world in the same perplexity, some others finally decide in favour of misguidance while some of the others find the signal of guidance from God after a long struggle. But most fortunate are those naturally sound, right hearted and good vision people who make correct use of God given intellect, eyes, ears and all His ordained powers. Draw correct inferences from observations and experiences. Take right lesson from the signs of God. All the attractions of falsehood fail to lure them. Tricks of falsehood cannot fascinate them. As soon as they look the crooked ways of misguidance they understand that these are not meant for man. Then as soon as they tilt towards the truth and take step to attain it, the truth welcomes them and the light of guidance shines on them. Now, after they have understood the truth as truth and false as false, no power of the world can repel them from the right path and turn towards the wrong way.

One thing is also important to note in this connection, especially the Muslims should always keep in mind. Whenever some good ideas are presented about Islam by non Muslim scholars, the Muslims generally propagate these views with great pride, as if their appreciation is a certificate to Islam. But this truth should never be forgotten that the truth and reality of Islam does not require appreciation of any one. As the shining of the sun does not require that any body should proclaim it shining, the heat of fire and the liquidity of water does not require that some one should proclaim their heat and liquidity, the truth of Islam also does not need the acceptance of anyone. The praise and appreciation of those is especially invaluable whose hearts do not tally



their tongues and who themselves deny their admiration and appreciation by their dislike and refusal. Were they acknowledging the truth of Islam, they would have believed in it. But when they denied believing despite verbal recognition they are in view of intelligent people like a man who recognizes the truth of a physician and accepts the accuracy of his prescription yet consults and follows the direction of an unauthorized physician for his cure.

Muslims should always remember that the recognition by any greatest non Muslim is not a matter of proud for Islam. Only one proud is enough for it. And that is the declaration of God, "The religion in presence of Allah is only the Islam" (*Aale imran:19*) and also, "I have accepted for you the Islam as religion" (*Al- Maida: 3*).

**Tarjumanul Quran; Muharram 1352 AH, May 1933 AC**

## Islam a Religion of knowledge and Reason

The ways of life or religions created by man through his own exploration can be divided into two types. One type is the product of the flights of thought having wondrous and astonishing appeals. The other types are the product of whims and wishes and appeal to the senses. Though in both these ways the reason and knowledge has been used, but the reason is neither their source of motivation, nor they appeal to it, nor it is their final aim. They are equipped with reason and knowledge only as an instrument which they use to achieve low standard objectives. One closes eyes from the material world and concentrates on the hidden world, uses all the powers of knowledge and reason in discovering those methods through which it could free the hidden powers of self (*nafs*) from material boundaries and become capable of obtaining inspirations, spiritual flavour and miracles. In contrast to it the other way distracts from the hidden world and concentrates on the material world, and here it uses all the powers of knowledge and reason in discovering those methods by which it could provide more and more comfort for the body by making use of material resources and could obtain sensual taste. Thus the knowledge and reason are in service of these methods but as such they are founded on ignorance and unawareness.

Compared to these there is a religion which God has sent through His messengers. It has come into existence from pure knowledge, perfectly appeals to reason and its real purpose is to bring man out of darkness to the light of knowledge, so that he may become aware of his true status, understand correct nature of his relationship with existents, and use his apparent and intrinsic powers and

material and spiritual resources to reach the true goal of human life. That is to correctly perform the service in the world that Allah has entrusted to him as His vicegerent and, in the hereafter, to be blessed by the pleasure of his Master which is the necessary consequence of performing the duty.

This religion does not spoil any faculty of man but tells the correct way of using each faculty. It does not deny any will of man but provides a legal limit to each one of them. It does not stop thoughts from lofty flight but provides it good environment and right direction. It does not check human practical skills from discovering and making use of material resources but turns them towards right objectives. It engages man in the activities he is naturally capable of, no matter if he is inclined towards materiality or spirituality. However, it wants to equip both kinds of people with such knowledge and reason which may help him keep away from extremes and walk on the straight path, understand and keep their duties as human beings, know and accomplish the rights of Allah, His creatures and their own self on them. If they opt to spirituality, they may not get lost in it so that the inspirations and spiritual flavour may become the only focus of their activities and if they chose material life they should not absorb in it so as to make only the physical comforts and material success their aim and objective.

It is all in all a religion of knowledge and reason. Therefore, its correct following cannot be without knowledge and reason. Here understanding and skill is required at every step. A person unaware of its spirit, unknown to its expedencies, not understanding its principles and not thinking on its teachings cannot walk with confidence on the path this religion shows. Its doctrine has no value so long as it does not encompass the

thought and conscience after passing through verbal declaration. The action is ineffective in it if not enlightened with the soul of knowledge and wisdom. Its legal following is meaningless unless the spirit of law does not overwhelm the heart and mind. If a person believes in the truth of this religion and follows it by way of imitation without understanding, then his faith and obedience is like a heap of sand which, every blow of wind can displace and take to somewhere else. There is no strength in the faith of such ignorant and obedience of such a blind. Every stray man may distract him from the right path. Every good looking way may attract him. Every whim, each hypothesis or any theory may shake the foundations of his faith. Every wave of wish and every gesture of general misguidance will float and take him to any where. If he likes antiquity, he will stick to each of the stray paths which he has inherited from the elders. If he is inclined to modernity, he will make god, his wishes and wander on each path which his devil of desires will present to him in decorated form. If he is weak by nature, he will follow each mover whom he will look attaining goals successfully. If he has some capability of devising ways through mental effort, he will make use of opinions and assessments instead of knowledge at each turning point in life because of the ignorance about the law of God and absence of insight in religion and will finally get strayed at any point. Thus the correct obedience of this religion of God and stability in the obedience is impossible with ignorance and in absence of understanding. Knowledge, understanding and reflection are indispensable in it and perfection in the grade and status of a person depends on the perfection of these attributes in him.

The truth of our statement will become obvious if you look at the history of this religion. The messengers sent by Allah did not bring only a law and a book, but also brought wisdom so that the people may understand and follow, with insight, the law sent through them. 'We gave the book and wisdom to the children of Abraham' (*Al Nisa: 54*). 'Taught him the book and wisdom' (*Aale Imran: 48*). 'Gave him wisdom' (*Sad: 20*). 'I have brought wisdom to you' (*Al Zukhruf: 63*). What this wisdom was? It was the understanding of religion, light of knowledge, brilliance of insight, capability of reflection and ability of understanding (*tafaqquh*). Whenever a messenger came, he gave his followers these things also in addition to the book with whose help they maintained themselves on the right path. After that, a period of ignorance and blind imitation approached in which wisdom disappeared and the book remained. People continued walking with the book on the path their elders left them. But now they became disposed to accept stray paths because now they were not equipped with the wisdom of understanding the book and distinguish guidance from the misguidance. Slowly their steps moved away from the right path. Somebody followed the lust, others abided by opinions and assessments, still others accepted the influences of strayed nations. Some people made strayed leaders their lords in place of Allah (*arbaabum min doonillah*). Finally the book also left them with wisdom, and the religion sent by Allah was transformed into a collection of suspicions, fables and stray thoughts and practices.

Thus the real cause of spoiling the religion of God, missing of the heavenly books or changes therein, and the spread of misguidance after guidance in nations is not that the reading of the words of the book or offering rituals is important, but the foundation is totally based on the

correct knowledge and understanding of the book. So long as the people remained equipped with wisdom, emphasized the importance of thinking on the signs of God and continued walking on the straight way of messengers with insight, nothing could misguide them. But when this quality missed from them, they became disposed to diseases. They became diseased from inside, and the epidemic also attacked them from outside till at last they strayed in thousands of wrong paths after loosing religion, book, law and every thing.

After the period of earlier messengers passed, Mohammad (SAW) was sent with such a book and guidance which was not in the danger of distortion or change like the earlier books because Allah *Ta'ala* has made such an arrangement of its protection that even if human beings try to change or finish it, they cannot succeed. But even today, making use of this book and guidance, establishing themselves on the straight path of religion and protection from the straying of belief and action totally depends upon the same thing on which the religion of God has been founded from the beginning i.e. knowledge and reason. The book of God and the way of the messenger is the best guide in all times and conditions, but for those who are equipped with knowledge and reason, who understand the instruction of Allah and His messenger, ponder over it, receive light from it and walk with this light in every way of life. As for those who have lost the wealth of understanding and reflection and are Muslims for their parents have left them as they were, for them there is in fact no stability in Islam. They are always in the danger of drift which may settle in them from within and also attack from outside. It is very possible that they will drift out of their own ignorance and because of not understanding. They may also unknowingly start

following the misguidance surrounding all over them. It is because they are not equipped with the basic requirement which may strongly establish them on the straight path of religion.

Only one cause of human misguidance has been mentioned in the Quran. That is not to understand the signs of Allah. Thus it calls attention to it again and again and strongly cautions against this deficiency.

إِنَّ شَرَّ لِّلْدَوَابِّ عِندَ اللَّهِ الصُّمُّ الْبُكْمُ الَّذِينَ لَا يَعْقِلُونَ

*"For the worst of beasts in the sight of Allah are the deaf and dumb, - those who understand not"* (al-Infal: 22)

لَهُمْ قُلُوبٌ لَا يَفْقَهُونَ بِهَا وَلَهُمْ أَعْيُنٌ لَا يُبْصِرُونَ بِهَا وَلَهُمْ  
أَذَانٌ لَا يَسْمَعُونَ بِهَا أُولَٰئِكَ كَالْأَنْعَامِ بَلْ هُمْ أَضَلُّ  
أُولَٰئِكَ هُمُ الْغَافِلُونَ ○

*"They have hearts wherewith understand not, eyes wherewith they see not, and ears wherewith they hear not. They are like cattle, - nay more misguided; for they are heedless (of warning)"* (al A'raf: 179)

صَرَفَ اللَّهُ قُلُوبَهُمْ بِأَنَّهُمْ قَوْمٌ لَا يَفْقَهُونَ ○

*"Allah has turned their hearts (from the light); they are a people that understand not."* (al Tauba: 127)

لَا تَنْتُمْ أَشَدُّ رَهَبَةً فِي صُدُورِهِمْ مِنَ اللَّهِ ذَٰلِكِ بِأَنَّهُمْ قَوْمٌ  
لَّا يَفْقَهُونَ ○

*"Of truth ye arouse greater fear in their hearts than Allah. This is because they are the men devoid of understanding."* (al Hashr: 13)

أَفَلَا يَتَذَكَّرُونَ الْقُرْآنَ أَمْ عَلَىٰ قُلُوبٍ أَقْفَالُهَا ○

*"Do they not then earnestly seek to understand the Quran, or is that there are locks upon their hearts?"*

(Mohammad: 24)

أَفَلَمْ يَدَّبَّرُوا الْقَوْلَ

*"Do they not ponder over the word (of Allah), or has any thing (new) come to them that did not come to their fathers of old?"*  
(al Muminun: 68)

The consequences of this absence of reflection and understanding appear in two forms which are the worst forms of drift.

One form of the drift is that a man depends in the matters of religion on other people, without understanding, whether they lead him to the way of salvation or ruin.

وَإِذَا قِيلَ لَهُمْ تَعَالَوْا إِلَىٰ مَا أَنزَلَ اللَّهُ وَإِلَى الرَّسُولِ قَالُوا  
حَسْبُنَا مَا وَجَدْنَا عَلَيْهِ آبَاؤُنَا أَوَّلُوهُمْ لَا يَعْلَمُونَ  
شَيْئًا وَلَا يَهْتَدُونَ

*"When it is said to them: 'Come to what Allah hath revealed; come to the messenger': they say: 'Enough for us are the ways we found our fathers following.' What! Even though their fathers were void of knowledge and guidance?"*  
(al Maida: 104)

إِتَّخَذُوا أَحْبَارَهُمْ وَرُهْبَانَهُمْ أَرْبَابًا مِّن دُونِ اللَّهِ

*"They take their priests and their anchorites to be their lords beside Allah."* (al Tauba: 31)

يَوْمَ تَقْلُبُ وُجُوهُهُمْ فِي النَّارِ يَقُولُونَ يَلَيْتَنَا أَطَعْنَا اللَّهَ  
وَأَطَعْنَا الرَّسُولَ ۖ وَقَالُوا رَبَّنَا إِنَّا أَطَعْنَا سَادَتَنَا وَكُبَرَاءَنَا  
فَاصْلُوا سَبِيلَنَا

*"The day their faces will be turned over in the fire, they will say: 'Woe to us! Had it been that, we had obeyed Allah and obeyed the messenger!'"*

*"And they would say: 'Our Lord! We obeyed our chiefs and our great ones, and they misled us as to the (right) path.'"*  
(al Ahzab: 66, 67)

The other form of drift is that the man leaving away the guidance of God trusts in his own opinion. First of all



there is, in this way, no confidence (which is sure way of walking on the right path), but it mostly consists opinions and conjectures. Moreover, it has a great danger; the human power of reason may be taken over by his wishes which often repel him from the right path and take to extremes. When a person walks on this way his parable is like that who walks in darkness as described in the Quran. If by chance the lightening of the sound reason fell upon him he could see the path and took some steps كَلَّمَا أَصَاءَ لَهُمْ مَشْرَافِيهِ (al Baqarah:20), otherwise stood وَإِذَا أَظْلَمَ عَلَيْهِمْ قَامُوا (al baqarah: 20). Or if started, either trapped in thorny place or fell in certain pit.

وَمَا يَتَّبِعُ أَكْثَرُهُمْ إِلَّا ظَنًّا إِنَّ الظَّنَّ لَا يُغْنِي مِنَ الْحَقِّ شَيْئًا

*"But most of them follow nothing but conjecture: truly conjecture can be of no avail against truth."* (yonus: 36)

أَرَأَيْتَ مَنِ اتَّخَذَ إِلَهَهُ هَوَاهُ

..... أَمْ تَحْسَبُ أَنَّ أَكْثَرَهُمْ يَسْمَعُونَ أَوْ يَعْقِلُونَ إِنْ هُمْ إِلَّا

كَالْأَنْعَامِ بَلْ هُمْ أَضَلُّ سَبِيلًا

*"Or thinkest those that most of them listen or understand? They are only like cattle; - nay, they are farther astray from the way."* (al Furqan: 44)

وَمَنْ أَضَلُّ مِمَّنِ اتَّبَعَ هَوَاهُ بِغَيْرِ هُدًى مِنَ اللَّهِ

*"And who is more astray than one who follows his own lusts, devoid of guidance from Allah?"* (al Qasas: 50)

وَلَا تَطْعُ مَنْ أَغْفَلْنَا قَلْبَهُ عَنْ ذِكْرِنَا وَاتَّبَعَ هَوَاهُ وَكَانَ أَمْرُهُ

فُرُطًا

*"Nor obey any whose heart We have permitted to neglect the remembrance of Us, one who follows his own desires, and his affair has become all excess."* (al Kahaf: 28)

وَلَا تَتَّبِعْ أَهْوَاءَ الَّذِينَ لَا يَعْلَمُونَ

*"And follow not the desires of those who know not."*

(Al Jathiyah: 18)

These are the consequences of not thinking upon the signs of God and not taking the benefit of reflection. Those who recite the *ayaat* of the book but do not understand them; have the book with them but do not try to attain insight in its teachings and do not try to know its commands; have faith in the truth of the messenger but are blind to the guidance presented by him; believe in the truth of Islam but are ignorant of its rules and spirit; they are, on every step, in the danger of being the prey of any two forms of misguidance described above. That is why Allah and his messenger have repeatedly reminded the Muslims of attaining insight in religion, understand its teachings and commands, and there should always be a group among them to keep busy in understanding religion to guide their brothers to *the* right path.

The Quran says:

كِتَابٌ أَنْزَلْنَاهُ إِلَيْكَ مُبَارَكٌ لِيَدَّبَّرُوا آيَاتِهِ وَلِيَتَذَكَّرَ أُولُوا  
الْأَلْبَابِ ○

*"(Here is) a book which we have sent down unto thee, full of blessings, that they meditate on its signs, and that men of understanding may receive admonishment."*

(swad: 29)

قَدْ فَصَّلْنَا الْآيَاتِ لِقَوْمٍ يُفْقَهُونَ ○

*"We detail our signs for people who understand."*

(al An'am: 98)

لَقَدْ مَنَّ اللَّهُ عَلَى الْمُؤْمِنِينَ إِذْ بَعَثَ فِيهِمْ رَسُولًا مِّنْ  
أَنْفُسِهِمْ يَتْلُوا عَلَيْهِمْ آيَاتِهِ وَيُزَكِّيهِمْ وَيُعَلِّمُهُمُ الْكِتَابَ  
وَالْحِكْمَةَ ○

*"Allah did confer a great favour on the believers when He sent among them a messenger from among themselves, rehearsing unto them the signs of Allah, purifying them, and instructing them in scripture and wisdom."*

(Aal-e- Imran: 164)

وَمَنْ يُؤْتَ الْحِكْمَةَ فَقَدْ أُوتِيَ خَيْرًا كَثِيرًا

*"He granteth wisdom to one whom He pleaseth; and he to whom wisdom is granted receiveth a benefit overflowing"* (al Baqara: 269)

فَلَوْلَا نَفَرَ مِنْ كُلِّ فِرْقَةٍ مِنْهُمْ طَائِفَةٌ لِيَتَفَقَّهُوا فِي الدِّينِ

وَلِيُنذِرُوا قَوْمَهُمْ إِذَا رَجَعُوا إِلَيْهِمْ ۚ

*"If a contingent from every expedition go forth to devote themselves to studies in religion, and admonish the people when they return to them."* (al Tauba: 122)

The prophet (SAW) has given several instructions in this connection. For example our leader Ali (RA) narrates:

قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم الا لا خير في عبادة

ليس فيها تفقه ولا علم ليس فيه تفهم ولا قراءة ليس فيها

تدبر.

*The prophet (SAW) said: "Lo! There is no virtue in the worship without understanding, the knowledge without insight and the recitation (of the Quran) without meditation."*

In another *hadith* it is said:

من يرد الله به خيرا يفقهه في الدين.

*"Allah blesses one with understanding whomsoever He wills to do well."*

One more *hadith* says:

افضل الناس افضلهم عملا اذا فقهوا دينهم.

*"Best among the people are those who are best in action provided that they have understanding in religion."*

Greatest and the real problem of Muslims in this period is that they are devoid of understanding in religion and do not reflect upon the book and *sunnah*. This weakness has made their beliefs hollow, worship spiritless, endeavours scattered and divergent, and their lives without order and system. Lovers of Islam among them are many, but very little understand it. There is no

scarcity of those who are ever ready to scarify their lives in the name of the Quran and Mohammad (SAW), but the people understanding the spirit of the religion presented by the Quran and Mohammad (SAW) are only like a tint of salt in the flour or even lesser than this. This is only because of this lack of understanding that among those who claim to be Muslims there are found worst types of suspicions and beliefs including partnership, refutation, materialism and opinions touching the boundaries of unbelief. They do not even feel that the Islam they claim to follow is completely different from their opinions. Worst is the condition of their moral and active life. From the formalities and customs similar to idol worshipping to the worst fruits of modern western culture, all kinds of patterns are common in a nation claiming to be the follower of Islam. And except little number of them, none of the groups senses where they have openly deflected from the rules and regulations of the law they express to believe in. Any wrong opinion and method coming from anywhere becomes current among them and they understand that there is space to this also in Islam. Every misguiding person walking on an attractive path easily becomes their leader and they understand that they can follow him also together with Mohammad (SAW). Every thing not Islam is gathered in one mind and life because the recognition between Islam and not Islam depends upon knowledge and understanding which is lacking here. One who distinguishes between the east and the west cannot be as foolish as to walk towards the east and think that he is going to the west. This can be done only by an ignorant, and we are commonly observing the same ignorance, except little groups, among all Muslims from east to west. It makes no difference if they are illiterate common people, certified (*dastar band* i.e. Turbanized

*ulama*), garmented religious mendicants (*Kharqa posh mashaikh*) or people educated in colleges and universities. Opinions and methods of these, though greatly differ, but all are equal in not knowing the truth and the spirit of Islam.

A very wise saying of the respected messenger (SAW) is:

صنفان اذا صلحا صلحت الامة واذا فسدا فسدت الامة

السلطان والعلماء.

*"There are two kinds of people. If they are right, the entire nation is right. If they are wrong, the whole nation is wrong. They are the commanders and the scholars (ulama)".*

Every chapter of Muslims' history is witness to the truth of this prophetic saying, and we are viewing this truth most prominently today. Was there *taqwa* and the correct knowledge of religion in our commanders and scholars, the situation would have not worsened to this extent. And if even today the Muslim *ummah* could find such leaders, there is no cause of desperation despite this much of deterioration.

**Tarjumanul Quran: Shawwal 54; January 1936**

## Concept of *Ibadah* in Islam

Among the religious concepts of man, the concept of *Ibadah* is foremost and the most important, or to say more correctly, the fundamental concept of religion is not but the *ibadah*. That is why all the religions of mankind investigated till now ----- no matter if they are composed of meaningless tales and illusions of most wild people or the pure beliefs of highly cultured nations -----none of them is devoid of the notion of *ibadah*. The facts of the oldest nations known as a result of anthropological and archeological discoveries witness that even though those nations were just in the beginning stage of reason and conscience, yet they considered someone as god and practiced certain method of *ibadah*<sup>1</sup>. Let aside the antique nations, even today there are some groups living in different corners of land which represent the level of oldest nations in reason and mind, or in other words are presenting the picture of the original man. These groups are very rarely found entirely without the concept of god and *ibadah*<sup>2</sup>. Thus it is an unavoidable truth that the concept of *ibadh* has always been with man during all his stages from wild living and village life to the most modern culture and cosmopolitan city life, though its ways of expression and structures have been changing.

---

<sup>1</sup> But the most recent anthropological studies point to the fact that the nation representing the original culture were equipped with the doctrine of unity and were devoid of idol worshiping (see '*Ilmul Aqwam*' written by Dr. Barren Umr Raulf Ehrin Phills, published by 'Anjuman Taraqqui-e-Urdu, Delhi). This fully supports the dictates of the Quran that the first religion of man is Unity, and idol worship is a later invention. This research has inverted the 19<sup>th</sup> century theory of religious philosophy.

<sup>2</sup> Study of the above mentioned book will help a lot.

### ***Ibadah* a Natural Urge:**

The important question is why it is so? Why this concept comprehends the entire humanity of all times, despite varying situations? Has it been opted intentionally? Then it was not possible for it to comprehend the entire humanity because there cannot be a perfect agreement among intentional options. Nothing opted by man can be found agreeable to all the groups of humanity during all the periods. It can also not be imagined that all the men of each time might have decided through a conference that they would necessarily *ibadah* of someone, even if gods are different and ways of *ibadah* are countless. Now, if it is not intentional, it must be supposed that the sentiment of *ibadah* is natural in man<sup>1</sup>. Just as man feels hunger naturally and he tries to search for the food to meet this urge, as he feels heat and cold and searches shadow and cloths to meet this natural requirement, as he has natural sentiment of expressing his thoughts and develops words and symbols to fulfill this natural urge, just in the same way the sentiment of *ibadah* develops in him naturally and he naturally requires a god and does *ibadah* of him. But as we observe in the case of hunger, feeling of cold and heat, and the desire of expression that the influence of nature remains confined only to inclination which compels man to search for the diet, shadow, cloth and expression, and activates the organs to fulfill these requirements. Similarity among all

---

<sup>1</sup> One can criticize that there have been many people and groups in each period without any religion and worship in doctrine and practice. The answer to this is that as the presence of a large number of eunuchs is not an evidence to that the sex is not natural, and as the presence of a large number of singles and hermits does not point to that the sexual activity is not natural, the presence of such people whose sentiments of worship has become dead because of some factors cannot be an evidence in favour that the sentiment of worship is not natural.

human beings is only to this extent. The influence of nature beyond this becomes weak and human intention becomes dominant wherefrom all those differences appear which have been found in different nations of all periods in the form of different forms of diets, houses, cloths, languages signs and symbols. Nearly same is the situation in the case of the sentiment of *ibadah* which leaves man after prompting him for *ibadah*. Hereafter, it depends upon human selection whom he makes his god and what way of *ibadah* he opts. Within the boundaries this free intention, the type of difference in gods and methods of *ibadah* begins as is seen in all the things opted by human beings. Though in this matter also the guidance of nature does not leave man totally alone, as it does not leave him in case of diet and cloth etc., but this guidance is as much dim and hidden that it's sensing requires very fine conscience which is available to few people.

Now we try to search the source of this natural inclination. Where is the centre of the force which pulls man for worship? What are those forces which compel man to search for god and do *ibadah* of him? And what is that guidance which we receive from nature during this search? For this we should first of all think over the truth about *ibadah* because the solution of this question is difficult without it.

### **The Truth of *Ibadh***

In fact the concept of *ibadah* is a comprehensive concept composed of two constituent notions. One is *bandgi* and the other is *parastish*. *Bandgi* means to follow and obey some powerful entity considering it great. And *parastish* means to bow before someone and revere him considering him pure, holy and noble. First of these is the



original and the basic concept of *ibadah*, while the second is the final and perfect concept.

## Obedience

*Bandgi* or obedience is offered always to one which has power, grip and control over that who obeys and the obedient has no leave to disobey him. Its limited form is that we generally see in case of the master and the servant, but for a wider view of the concept the most explicit example is of that obedience which the people show for their government. Government is neither a material object nor a sensible and observed thing. It is a tie of a system and order which commands over millions of people. People follow its law willingly or unwillingly. People inside their homes, peasants in their fields, travelers in far off forests where there is nothing to compel, obey its laws. Whoever living within its boundaries disobeys its laws is punished and in case of severe crime his all such rights are curtailed which he had as its subject. In this sense, as many as people live within the boundaries of a government and obey its law we use to say that they are obeying that government. If we use a religious term we can say that they are doing its *bandgi* and *ibdah*.

Now expend this view even more. Look at the whole universe. You will see that the entire universe and each of its particles is bound to a grand system. There is a law on which from a particle of clay to the sun shining in the sky is working willingly or unwillingly. Nothing can dare to disobey this law; turning away from it as minute as a point will destroy and finish it.

This grand law which encompasses man, animal, tree, stone, air, water, earthen objects and heavenly bodies is known as the natural law (*Qanoon-e-Fitrat*) or the divine law (*Qanoon-e-Qudrat*). According to it whatever duty is

given to a thing, it is doing it. Winds flow with its hint. Rain drops with its command. Water flows with its order. Planets move with its signals. Thus whatever is occurring in this world under this law and every particle is engaged in the work given by this law. What we call as life, perpetuity (*baqa*) and being (*koon*) is in fact the result of the obedience of this law, and what we call as death, destruction (*fana*) and disturbance (*fasad*) is the result of the disobedience of this law. In other words we can say that everything present and alive is following this law and nothing can keep existing and alive in this world without obeying it.

But as we see in the example of the government that following of the law is not in fact its following but is the obedience of the government which has established the law by its power and influence. And for the establishment of a system of government obviously a ruler, a central commander and a sovereign is necessary. Similarly the following of the natural law is in fact the following of that powerful government which is the maker and the runner of that law by force and this government is in the hand of that sovereign without which such a large system cannot work even for a while. Here if we change the legal word 'obedience' by the religious term '*ibadah*' and put the word Allah or *Khuda* in place of the ruler, we can say that the entire world and its every object is doing *ibadah* of Allah and this is an *ibadah* based on which is the existence and perpetuity of everything. Any object of the world and the world as a whole cannot be inattentive to the *ibadah* of Allah for a single moment and if it does, it cannot remain existent for a moment.

The Quran expresses this obedience (*bandgi*) as *ibadah* at some places and by *tasbeeh*, *sujood* and *qunoot* at other places.

وَمَا خَلَقْتُ الْجِنَّ وَالْإِنْسَ إِلَّا لِيَعْبُدُونِ

*"I have only created jinns and men that they may serve Me."*  
(al-zariyaat: 56)

وَلَهُ مَنْ فِي السَّمَوَاتِ وَالْأَرْضِ وَمَنْ عِنْدَهُ لَا يَسْتَكْبِرُونَ  
عَنْ عِبَادَتِهِ وَلَا يَسْتَحْسِرُونَ ۝ يَسْبَحُونَ اللَّيْلَ وَالنَّهَارَ لَا  
يَفْتُرُونَ ۝

*"To him belong all (creatures) in the heaven and on earth: even those who are with Him are not too proud to serve Him, nor are they (ever) weary (of the service): They celebrate His praises night and day, nor do they ever flag or intermit."*  
(al-Anbiya: 19, 20)

يُسَبِّحُ لِلَّهِ مَا فِي السَّمَوَاتِ وَمَا فِي الْأَرْضِ الْمَلِكِ  
الْقُدُّوسِ الْعَزِيزِ الْحَكِيمِ ۝

*"Whatever is in the heavens and on earth, doth declare the praise and glory of Allah, - the Sovereign, the holy One, the Exalted in might, the Wise."*  
(al-Jumu'ah: 1)

أَلَمْ تَرَ أَنَّ اللَّهَ يُسَبِّحُ لَهُ مَنْ فِي السَّمَوَاتِ وَالْأَرْضِ  
وَالطَّيْرِ صَفًّا كُلٌّ قَدْ عَلِمَ صَلَوَتَهُ وَتَسْبِيحَهُ

*"Seest thou not that it is Allah whose praise all things in the heavens and on earth do celebrate, and the birds (of the air) with wings outspread? Each one knows its own (mode of) prayer and praise."*  
(al-Noor: 41)

...وَلِلَّهِ مُلْكُ السَّمَوَاتِ وَالْأَرْضِ وَإِلَى اللَّهِ الْمَصِيرُ ۝

*"Yea, to Allah belong the dominion of heavens and the earth; and to Allah is the return."*  
(al-Noor: 42)

تُسَبِّحُ لَهُ السَّمَوَاتُ السَّبْعُ وَالْأَرْضُ وَمَنْ فِيهِنَّ وَإِنْ مِنْ  
شَيْءٍ إِلَّا يُسَبِّحُ بِحَمْدِهِ وَلَكِنْ لَا تَفْقَهُونَ تَسْبِيحَهُمْ ۝

*The seven heavens and the earth, and all things therein, declare His glory: there is not a thing but celebrates His praise; and yet ye understand not how they declare His glory..."*  
(Bani Israel: 44)

وَلَهُ مَنْ فِي السَّمَوَاتِ وَالْأَرْضِ كُلٌّ لَهُ قَانِتُونَ ۝

*"To Him belongs every being that is in the heavens and on the earth: all are devoutly obedient to Him."*

(al-Room: 26)

الْشَّمْسُ وَالْقَمَرُ بِحُسْبَانٍ ۝ وَ النَّجْمُ وَالشَّجَرُ يَسْجُدَانِ ۝

*"The sun and the moon follow courses (exactly) computed. And the herbs and the trees, both (alike) bow in adoration."*

(Al-Rahman: 5&6)

أَوَلَمْ يَرَوْا إِلَىٰ مَا خَلَقَ اللَّهُ مِنْ شَيْءٍ يَتَفَوَّاهُ ظِلُّهُ عَنِ الْيَمِينِ وَالشَّمَائِلِ سُجَّدًا لِلَّهِ وَهُمْ دَاخِرُونَ ۝ وَلِلَّهِ يَسْجُدُ مَا فِي السَّمَوَاتِ وَمَا فِي الْأَرْضِ مِنْ دَابَّةٍ وَالْمَلَائِكَةُ وَهُمْ لَا يَسْتَكْبِرُونَ ۝ يَخَافُونَ رَبَّهُمْ مِنْ فَوْقِهِمْ وَيَفْعَلُونَ مَا يُؤْمَرُونَ ۝

*"Do they not look at Allah's creation? Among things, - how their shadows turn round, from the right and the left, prostrating themselves to Allah, and that in the humblest manner? And to Allah doth prostrate all that is in the heaven and on the earth, whether moving creatures or the angels: for none are arrogant (before their Lord). They all fear their Lord, high above them, and they do all that they are commanded."*

(al-Nahl: 48-50)

أَلَمْ تَرَ أَنَّ اللَّهَ يَسْجُدُ لَهُ مَنْ فِي السَّمَوَاتِ وَمَنْ فِي الْأَرْضِ وَالشَّمْسُ وَالْقَمَرُ وَالنُّجُومُ وَالْجِبَالُ وَالشَّجَرُ وَالدَّوَابُّ وَكَثِيرٌ مِنَ النَّاسِ ۚ وَكَثِيرٌ حَقَّ عَلَيْهِ الْعَذَابُ ۚ وَمَنْ يُهِنِ اللَّهُ فَمَا لَهُ مِنْ مُكْرِمٍ ۚ إِنَّ اللَّهَ يَفْعَلُ مَا يَشَاءُ ۝

*"Seest thou not that to Allah prostrate all things that are in the heaven and on earth, - the sun, the moon, the stars; the hills, the trees, the animals; and the great number among the mankind? But a greater numbers are (also) such as unto whom the chastisement is justly due. And such as Allah shall disgrace, - none can raise to honour: for Allah carries out all that He wills."*

(al-Hajj: 18)

وَلِلّٰهِ يَسْجُدُ مَنْ فِي السَّمٰوٰتِ وَالْاَرْضِ طَوْعًا وَكَرْهًا  
وَضَلٰلًا لَهُمْ يَوْمَ الْقِيٰمَةِ وَالْاَصَالِ ۝

*"Whatever beings are there in the heavens and the earth do prostrate to Allah with good-will or in spite of themselves; so do their shadows in the morning and the evening."* (al-Ra'd: 15)

This *ibadah*, prostration, celebration of glory and devotion comprehends equally all the living, non-living, conscious and non-conscious things, and man is also bound to it as is a grain of soil, a drop of water and a piece of straw. A man believes in God or not, prostrates before God or stone, worships God or other than Him, if he is following the law of nature and is alive under this law, he is in fact doing the *ibadah* of Him inadvertently without knowing and intention; he is prostrating before Him and is busy in declaring His glory. His moving and walking, sleeping and waking, eating and drinking, standing and sitting, all this is His *ibadah*. Even though he is intentionally busy in worshiping and verbally obeying someone else, yet each of his hair is busy in the *ibadah* of God, Who has created him. His blood is circulating in His *ibadah*, his heart is pulsating in His *ibadah*, his organs are working in his *ibadah*; even that tongue by which he refutes God and praises others is moving in His *ibadah*.

### Reward of Obedience

What gift is received from God as a result of this *ibadah*? --- The grace of existence (*faizan-e-wujood*), maintenance (*rizq*) and the power of sustenance (*quwwat-e-baqa*). Whatever objects follow the law of God and obey Him, they remain alive and existent and they are provided that source of sustenance which we call *rizq* in our language. The objects which deflect from this law are overwhelmed by destruction, their maintenance is stopped

and they lose the grace of existence. This is occurring with everything of the world and in this matter there is no distinction between the tree and the stone, animal and man, and ungrateful (*kafir*) and grateful (*shakir*).

وَمَا مِنْ دَابَّةٍ فِي الْأَرْضِ إِلَّا عَلَى اللَّهِ رِزْقُهَا وَيَعْلَمُ  
مُسْتَقَرَّهَا وَمُسْتَوْدَعَهَا ○

*"There is no moving creature on earth but in sustenance dependeth on Allah: He knoweth its resting place and its temporary deposit."* (Hood: 6)

يَا أَيُّهَا النَّاسُ اذْكُرُوا لِلَّهِ عَلَيْكُمْ هَلٌ مِنْ خَالِقٍ غَيْرُ  
اللَّهِ يَرْزُقُكُمْ مِنَ السَّمَاءِ وَالْأَرْضِ لَا إِلَهَ إِلَّا هُوَ فَانِي  
تَوَفَّكُونَ ○

*"O men! Remember the grace of Allah unto you! Is there a creator, other than Allah, to give you sustenance from heaven or earth? There is no god but He: how then are you perverted?"* (Fatir: 3)

هُوَ الَّذِي جَعَلَ لَكُمْ الْأَرْضَ ذُلُولًا فَامْشُوا فِي مَنَاكِبِهَا  
وَكُلُوا مِنْ رِزْقِهِ ○

*"It is He who has made the earth manageable for you, so traverse ye through its tracts and enjoy of the sustenance which He furnishes:"* (al-Mulk: 15)

أَمْ مَنْ يَبْدَأُ الْخَلْقَ ثُمَّ يُعِيدُهُ وَمَنْ يَرْزُقُكُمْ مِنَ السَّمَاءِ  
وَالْأَرْضِ ءِ إِلَهٌ مَعَ اللَّهِ قُلْ هَاتُوا بُرْهَانَكُمْ إِنْ كُنْتُمْ  
صَادِقِينَ ○

*"Or, who originates creation, then repeats it, and who gives you sustenance from heaven and earth? (Can there be another) god besides Allah? Say, "Bring forth your argument, if ye are telling the truth."* (al-Naml: 64)

أَوَلَمْ يَرَوْا إِلَى الطَّيْرِ فَوْقَهُمْ صَفَتْ وَيَقْبِضْنَ مَا يُنْسِكْنَ  
 إِلَّا الرَّحْمَنُ إِنَّهُ بِكُلِّ شَيْءٍ بَصِيرٌ ۝ أَمِنْ هَذَا الَّذِي هُوَ جُنْدٌ  
 لَّكُمْ يَنْصُرُكُمْ مِنْ دُونِ الرَّحْمَنِ إِنَّ الْكُفْرَ الْإِلَ فِي  
 غُرُورٍ ۝ أَمِنْ هَذَا الَّذِي يَرْزُقُكُمْ إِنْ أَمْسَكَ رِزْقَهُ بَلْ  
 لَجُّوا فِي عُتُوٍّ وَنُفُورٍ ۝

*"Do they not observe the birds above them, spreading their wings and folding them in? None can uphold them except the most gracious: truly it is He that watches over all things.*

*Nay, who is there that can help you, (even as) an army, besides The Most Merciful? In nothing but delusion are the unbelievers.*

*Or who is there that can provide you with sustenance if He were to withhold His provisions?" (al-Mulk: 19-21)*

It is also explicit from the above text that as the man is equal to other things in this obedience, he has also been kept equal to others in the recompense and remuneration of obedience. Difference in the forms of reward, whatever it is found, is actually based on the abilities and needs. But if we ignore the forms and concentrate only on reality, we come to know that, as Allah is regulating, caring, helping and providing sustenance to a tree, animal, bird and a blade of grass, He also rewards man according to his need and ability. If there is any higher degree for man as compared to other creatures, it is only in the forms of the reward not in its reality, and the truth about the forms is that they are just according to the nature and the need of everything. The reward given to a rat just accords to its nature and need. Any other form of reward that we may consider better will be a punishment for him rather than a reward. Whatever comfort the most rewarded man feels in his flowery cradle, a tinniest bird feels in her grassy nest. The flowery cradle may be proud of itself, but in fact the

need of the nest dweller has been fulfilled according to its ability. In this sense the reward of both is equal. Moreover, it is equal between ungrateful and grateful; the believer and idol worshipper. Those who deny God do not worship Him, make His creatures His partners, consider the trees and stones equal to Him, are also rewarded by sustenance, grace of existence, safety and care as those who are strong believers in unity and worshippers of God, the One. Even if an unbeliever is ahead of a believer in obeying the law of nature or in other words in the natural *ibadah*, he finds a reward better than a believer, though in reality it is a deceptive wealth. Now the question, why the sentiment of *ibadah* naturally develops in human heart and why does he search for his God, can be easily solved. While the entire world and its every object is obeying an Omnipotent commander, and every hair of man is busy in His *ibadah*, all the elements of human body are prostrating before Him, the particular arrangement of these elements in him is because of His order and the very existence of man depends all the time on His obedience, the obedience and slavery in itself has become a fundamental part of the nature of man. Though he does not see the sovereign whose slave he is, nor like the governments of the world, the governors and the representatives of the government of God come to him, but because he has been created obedient and is obeying every time inadvertently and the government of his Master from all around ----- from inside and outside ----- has controlled him and everything around him, a sentiment of dedication, dejection and wretchedness, worship and prostration appears in him and his heart searches for a God to praise, discuss about His greatness, present to Him his obedience and faith, ask His help and seek His refuge at the time of every difficulty. It is this



nature that has kept man moving in search of God from the very time of his creation. Based on the same motif, he has framed some form of worship and this element is the cause of the appearance of religion.

### **Guidance of Nature in Search of God**

But as we have already said, nature has left man after creating an urge, a simple wish, pure attraction to search his objective by himself. In other words, nature plays the game of hide-and-seek with man. It invites him to an unknown object and goes behind the screen so that he should know, by using his reason and senses, what is the object of his loves, what his nature is asking to, where it is and how can it be obtained? It is this point where man faces difficulties and he has developed different ways that we see today in the varying cultures of humanity according to his ability of reason, reach of thought and reflection, and the capacity of intuition and inspiration. There is no doubt that nature has never left man alone in this search and investigation, freedom and selection. But it does not guide man as it helps animals at every step. It guides him in the form of very subtle signals, shows very little light which cannot be sensed by people having ordinary reason and insight. That is why often it has happened that the man's capacity of distinction failed in the search of correct path and his whims misguide him to the wrong paths.

For example, the purpose of nature behind the creation of wish to eat was that man should provide him diet to keep him alive and replacement of new items of diet may be made in place of consumed ones. But many of them could not understand truth of eating to live. They considered the attraction of taste attached to man's mouth and tongue by nature to help him search the diet as the

real objective. Thus the whim gave them the wrong notion of 'live to eat' and repelled them far away from the true objective. Similarly the need for dress and house were in fact for protection from bad seasonal effects. But the whim made it a source of pomp and show and the man stepped ahead of the purpose of nature and started making varying kinds of showy dresses and grand palaces, which finally proved harmful to him. This has happened with all the natural urges which created a need of different objects and the man not understanding the real purpose of nature, and sometimes even knowingly over sighting it, invented the methods superfluous to and in many cases against the purpose. Despite this these things passed over to generations as civilization, culture, formalities and customs. Afterward, their grip became so strong and they tied up human generations so that, let aside the capacity of understanding natural guidance, they could not even keep free to use their faculty of distinction and the methods of elders took the position of pious laws and diverted to the way of blind imitation. The nature is still giving signals and will continue to do so. The sound reason can every time understand them after little mental labour.

### **Signs of God in the Natural Guide**

Similar is the case of natural urge for the search of God. When the man began to search for a God initiated by the sentiment of *ibadah*, the nature started giving him fine hints towards the true God. The nature said to him that your God is one Who has created you, Who is beyond and above you, before Whom you are helpless, Who is above all, Who gives providence to you and all living beings, Who has a right to be praised by you because of His beauty and splendor, goodness and decency, Whose glow bestows light upon the sun, moon and stars, Whose

splendor provides this bloom, shinning and attraction to the sculptures of water and clay, Whose glory expresses in the form of water, waves, wind storm, earth quake, mountain's height, brute of loin and sting of snake, Whose providence takes the form of love and kindness in the breast of mother, milk in the udder of the cow and water in the core of stone. These fine hints were given in every period to the people having different levels of understanding and every person tried to solve the puzzle using the hints and according to his capacity. Man could understand these hints clearly when he was in the state of nature and bowed only before one God. But when he stepped ahead of this state and started walking in the track of argumentative thought, his perplexities began.

### **Perplexities of Man**

Someone searched the God of the above attributes on the earth, and fell in love with mountains, rivers, trees and the beneficial or harmful animals, began worshipping sexual organs, set in meditation before fire, prostrated before the air, presented his faith to the mother earth. In short, his sight fixed only at the neighbouring things.

Someone's sight could raise a little high. He satisfied not with earthly gods. He saw that these things worship like me some other things, depend on others. What do they have to give? For which we should stretch our hand for help and bow our forehead in faith. At last leaving the earth he searched his god in the sky. Looked at the sun, glanced over the moon, saw the glow of stars and said these are able to be worshipped.

But the one who was even more fine-sighted, could not find much difference in the bodies of the sky as compared to things on the earth. He said may they be tremendously high above, lighted and enlightening, yet

what can they do of their own? They are just moving according to an established law, a settled system. The sun despite all grandeur could not till date dare to rise any day in the west instead of the east or could slip an inch from its determined course. The moon could not rise as full on any of the day fixed for being crescent. Similarly no other planet could change its course even as little as the thickness of a hair. Looking at this obedience, helplessness and open subordination, this investigator of God turned his face from sky also. He considered all the physical objects unworthy of worship and stepped towards abstract ideas and spirituality. He became the lover of light, appreciated the idol of money, cherished the god of love, bowed before the goddess of beauty, prostrated to the god of power, suggested figures for the world forces and worshipped them, considered spirits, logos and angels worth worshipping and prostrated before them.

Thus in everything of nature the people equipped with different abilities saw greatness, lordship, blissfulness, power, beauty, fury, splendor and creativity, according to the reach of their mind and viewing ability, bowed before it. Whoever, could reach to whatever extent following the hint of nature stayed there. But those who were equipped with correct inspiration, finer consciousness and sounder ratio and were moving rightly according to the hints provided by nature were satisfied by none of these earthen and heavenly gods, spiritual and subjective idols. They stopped not on any of the middle stages and slowly reached a destiny whereby they could see all the material, spiritual, mental, higher and lower forces fastened tightly with the grip, busy in worship, prostrated before and calling the glory of some other power. Here they heard this voice from their ears of heart:

لَا إِلَهَ إِلَّا أَنَا فَاعْبُدُونِ ○

*"There is no god but I; therefore, worship and serve Me"*  
(*al-Anbiya'*: 25)

This was the voice of the same God whose search they began. The beloved himself spoke seeing that the lover is near. He Himself stepped ahead and told His address. The journey finished here, the destiny reached and the investigators were satisfied.<sup>1</sup> Irrefutable truth is that, nobody felt unrest to search more after receiving this guidance. Whatever unrest, discomfort or unease was there, it was in the middle stages. Every heart witnessed after reaching this last stage that the same was the object of search, there is no need of further search.

أَلَا بِذِكْرِ اللَّهِ تَطْمَئِنُّ الْقُلُوبُ

*"Without doubt in the remembrance of Allah do hearts find satisfaction."*  
(*al-Ra'd*: 28)

So long as man did not reach the one God in his search he remained uneasy and unsatisfied, and the urge of search and prick of investigation continued pinching him. Once he found one God his heart became satisfied. Then he never felt the unrest to search god.

### **Allah the One is the True God**

Now the question is why it was so? Why was it that the journey of searching god ended nowhere but reaching at God, and ended there in such a way that no need of

---

<sup>1</sup> Now a day, most of writers on religion are tilted towards the theory of historical evolution. They say that the man began with the lowest forms of idol worship. With the increase in the standard of reason, the status of gods also heightened and the number fell down until he reached at Unity. But the history itself refutes this theory. Two thousand five hundred years before the Jesus (AS), Abraham (AS) believed in pure unity and after two thousand years after Jesus (AS) and even today millions of people worship idols. Is the proof of historical evolution? Truth is that lowest forms of idol worship and the highest level of unity (*tawhid*) have been found in all periods and they are found even today. Difference is there in the grades of human minds and thoughts not in the sequence of history.

further search was felt? A little reflection on this aspect tells that the real purpose of the sentiment which compels man to worship is the worship of one God. So long as he does not reach this true God he is not satisfied and cannot be satisfied. The case is different if the rational and intellectual incapability, bigotry, obstinacy or blind imitation of elders let not feel this dissatisfaction to some people.

As we have told above, the sentiment of worship in man develops only because each and every particle of entire world around him is busy in obeying God. In this situation when a man in darkness and ignorance unknowing God worships other than God, no element around him and even no part of his own body participate in his act. The feet which he uses to step towards his created god move in obedience to God. He offers gifts to him by those hands which move in obedience of God. The head he prostrates before him already bows before God. The tongue he uses in his admiration, are busy in the admiration of God. In this situation his entire worship, all this adoration and reverence is a lie, a deception, open dishonesty which is refuted by each particle of the universe. The nature of man itself repeatedly warns him in fine and insensible voice, 'what fraud have you been caught in'? Don't you feel shy of obeying the obedient, worshipping the worshipper and following the follower?

أَفِ لَكُمْ وَلِمَا تَعْبُدُونَ ○

*"Fie upon you and upon things that ye worship"*

(*al-Anbiya: 67*)

Worship (*parastish*) is in fact the branch of obedience (*bandgi*) and wants, according to its nature, to live with its base. When the man based on his ignorance separates the branch from the base i.e. obeys one and worships the other, this separation goes clearly against the nature and

creates a very fine and insensible dissatisfaction on sub conscious level. In contrast to it when the screen of ignorance dissolves ---- the man knows the truth that the God is one Who is the master, creator and the Lord ----- the obedience (*bandgi*) and worship (*parastish*) become one , the branch joins the base, the daughter goes in the lap of her mother. The taste and pleasure receives by heart in this union was absent in the situations of separation.

### **Vicegerency and Deputyship of God**

This congruence of obedience and worship is such a character that makes man higher than other creatures, a status which Allah has designated as vicegerency (*khilafat*) and deputyship (*niyabat*). Look back to the above discourse. I have already told that the man is obeying (*bandgi*) God inadvertently and unknowingly and exactly in the same way as irrational animals unconscious plants and lifeless stones are doing. In this sense he is not different from other creatures. And, in fact, he is also not distinct from other creatures in the reward of this obedience i.e. the favour of existence and daily provisions. The distinction and the higher status is in the reason, the consciousness, freedom, intention and the power of knowledge that he has been provided with, if used by him in recognizing the One Whose servant he is. He obeys and worships consciously, the One Whom he obeys and worships unconsciously. If he did not do it and recognized not his Master by using his reason and the power of knowledge, and began obeying and worshipping others out of his free choice, then what for the higher status? In fact he has fallen to the lowest of the animals.

لَهُمْ قُلُوبٌ لَا يَفْقَهُونَ بِهَا وَلَهُمْ أَعْيُنٌ لَا يُبْصِرُونَ بِهَا وَ  
 لَهُمْ آذَانٌ لَا يَسْمَعُونَ بِهَا أُولَئِكَ كَالْأَنْعَامِ بَلْ هُمْ أَضَلُّ  
 أُولَئِكَ هُمُ الْغَافِلُونَ ○

*"They have hearts wherewith they understand not, eyes wherewith they see not, and ears wherewith they hear not. They are like cattle, --- nay more misguided; for they are heedless."*  
 (al-A'raaf: 179)

There is no greatness and higher status in reason and knowledge as such. This is only an instrument for getting higher status. This instrument has made man capable of using it properly and raising his status from inadvertent *ibadah* of an animal to the advertent *ibadah* of a man. But if the man misused this instrument, and leaving the one whose servant he is in true sense, he did the *ibadah* of those whose servant he is not<sup>1</sup>, he in fact fell to a level even lower than that of the animals. The animal was not misguided, he became. Animal did not falsify, he did. Animal was not an unbeliever and idol worshipper, the man was. The animal stayed on the status with which it was created. Man being an animal also stayed on the same level but as a man he did not rise as he should have done, but in contrast, fell down. He did not use the instrument of reason for escalating humanity and used it in developing animal character. He invented the telescope to see far more distant things than an animal can see. He developed radio to listen more distant voices than an animal can listen. He invented the train and car to cover more distance than he could cover. He developed air planes to go ahead of the birds, created ships to win over the fishes. He developed weapons to surpass the beasts. He collected goods to pass comfortable life more than animals. But

---

<sup>1</sup> Lust is one of these gods. One who does not obey Allah, obeys either the idols, self made gods, people like Pharaoh, or his own lust.



could he rise even a bit above animals despite all these developments? Whatever grip he is taking on the material world with the help of his knowledge is just under those natural laws which an animal is using within a limited range without having reason and knowledge. Then it is the same position of unconscious obedience on which an animal is standing. The only difference is that the animal obeyed at a lower level and got the provisions of lower level, and the man by using the power of knowledge obeyed at a higher level and received high level provisions. The animal was receiving grass, the man obtained toast and butter. The animal was provided with hairs and wool, the man received decent cloths. The animals were provided with the nest and man was rested in bungalows and big houses. Animal had to run on foot, he was provided with car. It is enough reward of his animal obedience and forced *ibadah*. It is to look what kind of development did he do out of the instrument of development he was provided with? The development meant that he would have prostrated as a man eagerly before the same God, he was prostrating to, as an animal by force. As a man he should have obeyed the moral law of the same God whose natural law he has to follow as an animal. If he developed on these lines he, undoubtedly, raised higher than animals and all the existents. He factually received the vicegerency for which he was potentially created. He obeyed and did the *ibadah* of his creator more than all the existents of the world. Therefore, he became the most righteous and worthy of all the existents for the reward. But if he did not show this development and used his instrument of development in the reverse direction, he fell without doubt lowest of the low, the most desolate. He made himself punishable with

his own foolishness.<sup>1</sup> The same truth has been expressed in *surah al-Teen* as follows:

لَقَدْ خَلَقْنَا الْإِنْسَانَ فِي أَحْسَنِ تَقْوِيمٍ ۝ ثُمَّ رَدَدْنَاهُ أَسْفَلَ  
سَافِلِينَ ۝ إِلَّا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا وَعَمِلُوا الصَّالِحَاتِ فَلَهُمْ أَجْرٌ  
غَيْرُ مَمْنُونٍ ۝

*"We have indeed created man in the best of mould. Then do we abase him (to be) the lowest of the low. Except such as believe and do righteous deeds, for they shall have reward unfailing."* (al-Teen: 4-6)

This brief is pointing to the details given above. "Best mould" is the power and potentiality that the man has been provided with in most abundance as compared to all other creatures. But simply being provided with best mould is not the development in fact. Growth depends upon the fact that the man should utilize this power and potential in recognizing his creator --- a quality which at a higher level is called *iman* ---- and work according to His moral directives that is termed as good deed (*'amal-e-saleh*). The one who did not do this fell lower than the lowest of the creatures. And the one who committed to this development became worthy of the endless reward (*ajrun ghairu mamnun*) that continues from this world to the hereafter. The reward of forced obedience finishes. The life is given for a fixed period of time and the provisions continue till that day. But the reward of advertent obedience is free of obstruction and there is no fear of obstacle in the provision.

---

<sup>1</sup> This discussion requires great attention. Some people have badly stumbled in this problem. They consider the following of natural and physical laws alone as true *ibadah*. They opine that whoever--- man or nation--- is accomplished in this *ibadah* is chaste and worshipper, and also worthy of all the promises made to the chaste people in the Quran. Though the *ibadah* required by man is not simply the following of natural laws but it includes obeying the moral law also.

## Perfect Meaning of *Ibadah*

Now we have reached a stage where the correct and perfect meaning of *ibadah* become obvious. It has become explicit by the above discussion that the meaningful parts of *ibadah* are two which together fully accomplish the meaning of the word. One of them is obedience (*bandgi*) i.e. correctly following the law of nature without any repulsion. The other is worship (*parastish*) which requires two things for accomplishment.

1. The true and pure knowledge of Allah without a tint of partnership, unbelief and doubt. No fear of other than Allah, no hope of reward from others and no trust. No Lord, no Beneficent, no harm giving other than God. No relationship of obedience with others. This is what is called *iman*.
2. Following the moral law of Allah in the intentional aspects of life the same as the natural law is followed in the unintentional part of life so that the entire life may become harmonious and no disharmony and contradiction may remain in life. This is known as good deed (*'amal-e saleh*).

Wrong is the statement, whoever says, that the *ibadah* is confined to rosary (*tasbeeh*), place of prayer (*musalla*) and the monastery (*khanqah*). A chaste believer is not the worshipper of Allah only if he offers five prayers in a day, fasts for a month out of twelve, pays poor tax in a year and makes pilgrimage once in life, but his entire life is *ibadah*. Does he not do *ibadah* when he is content with the allowed modes of earning and leaves the blameworthy methods? When he refrains in dealings from tyranny, lie and deception and opts for justice and truth --- is it not *ibadah*? Is not every movement of a person the act of *ibadah* when he stands for the service of Allah's creature and providing them their rights? Shall every word and

action not be considered *ibadah* if a person obeys Allah and keeps His boundaries in all his words and actions? The fact is that whatever a person does in matters of religion or the world but following the command of Allah is *ibadah* through and through, included in it is his sale purchase in the market, interaction with the family and business in purely world affairs.

But this is the low grade of *ibadah*. The example of this *ibadah* is like the common people of a subject following the laws of the king and obeying his commands. The level higher than this is that a man becomes the servant of his master and follow his commands not only by own self but also try to apply them on others, try hard to accomplish them in the world, live in his territory with peace faith and obedience not only himself but also uses the powers of his heart, mind and limbs in establishing peace, reforming the subjects, fighting the miscreants and his heart body and wealth in this way.

وَكَذَٰلِكَ جَعَلْنَاكُمْ أُمَّةً وَسَطًا لِتَكُونُوا شُهَدَاءَ عَلَى  
النَّاسِ وَيَكُونَ الرَّسُولُ عَلَيْكُمْ شَهِيدًا ۝

*"Thus have We made you an Ummat justly balanced. That you might be witnesses over the nations and the messenger a witness over yourselves;" (al-baqara: 143)*

هُوَ سَمُّكُمْ الْمُسْلِمِينَ مِنْ قَبْلُ وَفِي هَٰذَا لِيَكُونَ الرَّسُولُ  
شَهِيدًا عَلَيْكُمْ وَتَكُونُوا شُهَدَاءَ عَلَى النَّاسِ فَأَقِمْوَا  
الصَّلَاةَ وَآتُوا الزَّكَاةَ وَاعْتَصِمُوا بِاللَّهِ

*"It is Ye Who has named you Muslims, both before and in this (revelation); that the messenger may be a witness for you, and you are witness for mankind! So establish regular prayer, give Zakat and hold fast to Allah!"*

*(al-hajj: 78)*

الَّذِينَ إِنْ مَكَّنَّاهُمْ فِي الْأَرْضِ أَقَامُوا الصَّلَاةَ وَآتَوُا الزَّكَاةَ  
وَأَمَرُوا بِالْمَعْرُوفِ وَنَهَوْا عَنِ الْمُنْكَرِ

*"Those whom, if We establish them in the land, establish regular prayer and give Zakat, enjoin the right and forbid the wrong."* (al-Hajj: 41)

This is the truth of the *ibadah* about which have begun to think that it is simply the prayer, fasting, rosary and repeating the words *la ilaaha illallah* (there is no god but Allah) and it has nothing to do with the world affairs. Though in fact fasting, prayer, *hajj*, *zakat*, remembrance and rosary are such training courses which raise the ordinary animal life of man to the highest human level, make him the follower and obedient of his Master in both the aspects of free intentional life and forced natural urges and make him such a servant of the True King who serves Him throughout life by all heart and energy. When the man rises to this level through *ibadah*, he gets such a high status that nothing in the world can claim to be equal to him; even angels are lower than him. He becomes the vicegerent (*Khalifah*) of Allah in action. He is not made to meanly stretch his hand before others for help. He has no slavery bond to others in his neck. He has no chain in his feet other than the chain of Allah. His head does not bow before any command other than the command of Allah. He is the slave of Allah and the master of all. He is the servant of God and the commander of all. He is worthy of governing the earth by the permission of God. He is not a traitor, snatches not the right of others like Pharaoh and Nimrud but is the deputy of Allah by his permission and governs the land rightly and rightfully.

وَعَدَ اللَّهُ الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا مِنْكُمْ وَعَمِلُوا الصَّالِحَاتِ  
لَيَسْتَخْلِفَنَّهُمْ فِي الْأَرْضِ كَمَا اسْتَخْلَفَ الَّذِينَ مِنْ قَبْلِهِمْ وَ  
لَيُمَكِّنَنَّ لَهُمْ دِينَهُمُ الَّذِي ارْتَضَى لَهُمْ وَلَيُبَدِّلَنَّهُمْ مِنْ بَعْدِ  
خَوْفِهِمْ أَمْنًا يَعْبُدُونَنِي لَا يُشْرِكُونَ بِي شَيْئًا ۝

*"Allah has promised, to those among you who believe and work righteous deeds, that He will, of a surety, grant them in the land, inheritance (of power), as He granted it to those before them: that He will establish in authority their religion --- the one which He has chosen for them; and that He will change (their state), after the fear in which they (lived), to one of security and peace: they will worship Me (alone) and not associate aught with me."*

(al-Noor: 55)

This is the reward in the world. And what is the reward in the hereafter? That is:

وَمَنْ يُطِيعِ اللَّهَ وَرَسُولَهُ وَيُخَشِ اللَّهَ وَيَتَّقِهِ فَأُولَئِكَ هُمُ  
الْفَائِزُونَ ○

*"It is such as obey Allah and his messenger, and fear Allah and do right, that will triumph."* (al-Noor: 52)

رَجَالٌ لَا تُلْهِهِمْ تِجَارَةٌ وَلَا بَيْعٌ عَنْ ذِكْرِ اللَّهِ وَإِقَامِ الصَّلَاةِ  
وَإِيتَاءِ الزَّكَاةِ يَخَافُونَ يَوْمًا تَتَقَلَّبُ فِيهِ الْقُلُوبُ وَالْأَبْصَارُ ○  
لِيَجْزِيَهُمُ اللَّهُ أَحْسَنَ مَا عَمِلُوا وَيَزِيدَهُم مِّن فَضْلِهِ ۗ

*"Men whom neither trade nor sail can divert from the remembrance of Allah, nor from regular prayer, nor from paying zakat. Their (only) fear is for the day when hearts and eyes will be turned about, --- that Allah may reward them according to the best of their deeds, and add even more for them out of His Grace."* (al-Noor: 37, 38)

### Wrong Concept of Ibadah

Alas! The Muslims forgot this correct and true concept of *ibadah*. They gave the name *ibadah* to some selected activities and considered *ibadah* to accomplish only these activities and that the truth of the *ibadah* can be established only doing them. This great misunderstanding deceived common people as well as elite persons. The people freed the entire time except a little consumed in this *ibadah*. Broke every rule and limit of Allah, lied,

committed to back biting, broke promises, ate blameworthy earnings, breached the rights of people, did injustice to the weak persons, engaged out of lust, the eyes, hands and feet in disobedience but offered five time prayer, recited the Quran simply orally, fasted for a month in a year, gave some alms out of treasures, made pilgrimage once, and assumed that we are *ibadah* offering people. Is it the *ibadah* that you bow before every false god as soon as you raise head from prostration, make every living and nonliving your problem solver, make god any person whom you consider able to harm or profit you, beg and kiss the feet of even unbelievers for a loaf of bread, consider them the sustainers, giver of honour and dishonour, only their law as the law because they have power, break the law of God without hesitation because in your view He has no power of applying it. Is it your Islam? Is it the glory of your *iman*? On this do you believe that you do *ibadah*? If this is the Islam and Imam and if this is the *ibadah* of Allah, then what is that which has made you mean and wretched in the world? What is making you beg at every door other than the door of God? What has made you wear the necklace of slavery and meanness in your necks?

In contrast to it the elites opted for the other way. They set in closets with rosary and praying mats. The servants of God are caught in misguidance, injustice is spreading in the world, darkness of falsehood is overshadowing the light of truth, land of God is going in the hands of tyrants and rebels, Servants of God are being made to obey the devilish forces in place of Allah's law, but they are going on offering additional prayer after prayer, moving the beads of rosary, provoking the slogans of *hu* and *haq*, read the Quran but only for reward, read the *hadith* but only for blessing, give speech on the character of the messenger

and his companions with no aim other than the taste of storytelling. They find the lesson of enjoining good, prohibiting from vices, and struggle in the way of Allah neither in the Quran nor in *hadith* or the holy *seerah* and the model of the companions. Is it *ibadah*? Is this the *ibadah* that the storm of vices is raising high before you and you keep busy in meditation with your eyes closed? Is it called the *ibadah* that the storm is striking to the walls of your closet and you are busy in additional prayer with the door closed? Is it the *ibadah* that the unbelievers freely move beating the drums of devilish victory, their order spread in the world, their governance work, their law is enforced, their sword commands, the servants of God bow before them and you, leaving the God's land and his creatures, keep busy in prayers, fasting and remembrance (*zikr*). If that is what you are doing then what is this that you do the *ibadah* and the governance and order of the land is given to the others? Is the promise made to you in the Quran by Allah (I seek His refuge) is a lie?

وَعَدَ اللَّهُ الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا مِنْكُمْ وَعَمِلُوا الصَّالِحَاتِ  
 لَيَسْتَخْلِفَنَّهُمْ فِي الْأَرْضِ كَمَا اسْتَخْلَفَ الَّذِينَ مِنْ قَبْلِهِمْ وَ  
 لِيُمَكِّنَنَّ لَهُمْ دِينَهُمُ الَّذِي ارْتَضَى لَهُمْ وَلِيُبَدِّلَنَّهُمْ مِنْ بَعْدِ  
 خَوْفِهِمْ أَمْنًا يَعْبُدُونَنِي لَا يُشْرِكُونَ بِي شَيْئًا ۝

*"Allah has promised, to those among you who believe and work righteous deeds, that He will, of a surety, grant them in the land, inheritance (of power), as He granted it to those before them: that He will establish in authority their religion --- the one which He has chosen for them; and that He will change (their state), after the fear in which they (lived), to one of security and peace: they will worship Me (alone) and not associate aught with me."*

(*al-Noor*: 55)

If God is true to His promise, and the fact is that despite this *ibadah* neither you are given the vicegerency



## ***Jihad* in the Way of Allah**

Generally the Arabic word *jihad* is translated into English as 'holy war' and it has been explained for a long time in such a way that now it connotes 'the zeal of madness'. As soon as this word is listened, a picture in minds appears as if a group of religious lunatics is rushing with open swords in hands, beards on faces, beastly eyes, shouting "Allah Akbar". Wherever this group finds an unbeliever, it holds him, puts sword on his neck and says, 'say there is no god but God, otherwise the head will be amputated just now'. The experts have painted our picture with fine brush and have written below:

"The blood smells from the stories of this nation"

Fine thing is that the artists of our picture are those 'kind' people who are indulged in a great unholy war for few centuries. Their own picture is this that the people hungry of wealth and authority, equipped with all kinds of weapons have jump over entire world like dacoits in search of trade markets, natural resources, lands to colonize and capture mines, to provide fuel for the inextinguishable fire of their lust. Their war is not in the way of Allah, it is in the way of their belly, lust and the evil inciting spirit. It is enough for them to attack a nation only because her land has mines and is productive, or their own products could be sold in her area, their excess population may be settled there, and it is no less a sin of that nation that she happens to live in the way between them and the country which they have won or want to win. Whatever we did is the story of the past but their works are live and before the eyes of the present world day and night. Which of the part of land in Asia, Africa,

Europe, America, or the entire globe has not become blood red as a result of their unholy war? But their expertise is appreciable. They made our picture so great and dangerous that their own picture has hidden behind ours. Appreciable is our naivety also. When we saw our picture sketched by others we were so afraid that we lost sense to see the faces of the artists themselves, and began apologizing. Sir, we know not fight or war, we are peaceful preachers like saints and monks. Denying certain doctrines and making others acceptable is the only work we do. What relation do we have with sword? However, we have committed only this much of mistake that we have fought if anybody has come to fight us. But now we have renounced it also. We have abolished on state level the *jihad* of the sword for the satisfaction of your Excellency. Now, *jihad* is the name of only the activity of tongue and pen. Using canon and gun is the responsibility of state; we are only to use tongue and pen.

### **Causes of Misunderstanding about *Jihad***

This was a reference to the political bustle. But when we scientifically analyze those causes for which to understand activity of '*jihad* in the way of Allah' has become difficult to understand for non Muslims and even for Muslims, two fundamental misunderstandings are traceable.

First is that the Islam has been considered a religion in the sense as the word religion is commonly understood.

Second is that the Muslims are considered as a nation in the sense as the word nation is generally used.

These two misunderstandings have changed not only the problem of *jihad*, but as a whole the picture of Islam, and made the position of Muslims completely wrong.

Religion, according to a general term means nothing but a collection of few doctrines prayers and rituals. According to this meaning the religion should in fact be a private affair. You are free to believe in any doctrine and call any way the one your conscience likes to pray. If you have any zeal and enthusiasm to this religion, the most you can do is to preach this religion in the world and have discourses with the followers of other doctrines. What chance is there for this to take sword in hand? Do you want to make others accept your doctrine by force? This question necessarily arises if you have considered Islam as a religion in the above sense. And if this is, in truth, the position of Islam, then *jihad* in fact cannot be proven for it.

Similarly the meaning of nation as understood are none other than a homogeneous group of men who have become closed together and distinct from others because of some common commitments in some basic matters. Any group who is a nation in this sense takes and can take sword only for two causes. Either anybody attacks her to snatch her rights or she herself attacks to snatch the rights of others. In the first case there is some allowance to resort to the sword (even though some spirituals "دهرماتما" consider it also not permissible) but the second case cannot be permitted except by some dictators. Even the administrators of kingdoms as great as Britannia and French cannot dare to declare it allowed.

### **The Reality of *Jihad***

Thus, if Islam is a 'religion' and 'Muslims' are a nation, the entire meaningfulness of *jihad* on the basis of which it has been named as the highest *ibadah* comes to an end. But the reality is that Islam is not the name of a 'religion' and the Muslims do not make a 'nation'.

Contrary to it Islam is a revolutionary theory and viewpoint which wants to change the social order of the world and mould it according to its theory and view point. And 'Muslim' is the name of that international revolutionary party which the Islam organizes to bring about its revolutionary program. And *jihad* is the name of the revolutionary struggle and exhaustive use of the energy to achieve an aim.

Like all other revolutionary view points, Islam also uses its own terms as against the words commonly used so that its revolutionary ideas may be distinctly recognizes from others. The word *jihad* also belongs to this specialized terminological language. Islam has intentionally not used words like *harb* (حرب) and other similar words connoting war and instead resorted to use the word *jihad* which means struggle of a higher degree. Its correct meanings can be conveyed as follows:

"To exert one's utmost endeavor in furthering a cause"

The pertinent question is why this new word was used leaving all other old words? The only answer to this is that the word 'war' was used and is still used for the combat between nations and kingdoms for lustful objectives. These wars are fought for those personal and public objectives which have no idea of supporting any view or principle. As the fight in Islam is not of this type, it drops the use of this word as such. It has nothing to do with the benefit of a nation or the harm of another. It has no interest in the power of a kingdom or another in the land. It is interested only in the welfare of humanity. It has its own viewpoint and way of action for this welfare. Islam wants to efface any government against this viewpoint and way of action without consideration of any nation or country. Its purpose is to establish the government of its viewpoint and way of action without any consideration of

who raises its flag and whose government is affected by it. It asks for the land ----- not a part but entire globe ----- not for the purpose that the order of the land may be taken from one nation and given to another, but for benefitting the entire humanity by its viewpoint and program. For this it wants to use all those powers and energies which can be useful in bringing about this revolution, and gives the name "*jihad*" to the use of these powers and energies. To change the viewpoint of people by the power of speech and pen and to bring about mental revolution in them is also *jihad*. To change the old tyrannical system by the power of sword and establish new just system is also *jihad*. And the expenditure of wealth in this way and physical labour is also *jihad*.

### **"In the Way of God": A Necessary Condition**

But Islamic *jihad* is not simple *jihad*, it is the "*jihad fi sabeelillah*" (struggle in the way of God), and *fi sabeelillah* (in the way of God) is its necessary condition. The word *fi sabeelillah* also belongs to the special Islamic terms as I have just pointed out. People misunderstood this term also and considered forcedly making obedient to Islam as *jihad fi sabeelillah*, because in their narrow minds no other concept of these words could enter while the concept itself is very wide in Islamic language. Islam considers *fi sabeelillah* any activity of collective welfare without the purpose of drawing physical worldly benefit and with the purpose of pleasing Allah. For example, if you give alms with the intention that its benefit should morally or physically return to you in the same world, then this act is not *fi sabeelillah*. And if your purpose by almsgiving is to please God by helping a poor person, your act is *fi sabeelillah*. Thus this term is especially used for such good deeds which have been done with perfect

sincerity and pure from every kind of lust with a view that the welfare of other human beings causes to please God, and the sole purpose of human life is none other than pleasing the Master of the world. The condition of *fi sabeelillah* for  *Jihad* is also for the same purpose. It means that whenever a person or a group stands to change the system of a government and labours to mould it according to the Islamic viewpoint, he should not let his lust involved in this activity and sacrifice. He should not seek at dethroning a Caesar and himself become another Caesar. There should be no tint of any wish to collect wealth, name, fame, power and respect for him. All his sacrifices and hard work should aim at establishing just system among the God's servants without the wish of any remuneration other than the pleasure of God. The Quran says:

الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا يُقَاتِلُونَ فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ وَالَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا يُقَاتِلُونَ  
فِي سَبِيلِ الطَّاغُوتِ ۝

*"Those who believe fight in the cause of Allah, and those who reject faith fight in the cause of evil..." (al-Nisa': 76)*

The root word of *taaghut* (طاغوت) used in the above ayah is *tughyan* (طغيان) which means to go out of limit. When a river overflows we say that it is in *tughyan*. (طغيان). Similarly when a man crosses his allowed limits by using force to become the god of people or receive more than his portion, then he is fighting in the way of *taaghut* (طاغوت). Compared to it the war in the way of God is fought with the sole purpose of establishing the rule of God, the warrior himself follows this rule and makes others to follow it. Thus the Quran says:

بَلْكَ الدَّارُ الْآخِرَةُ نَجْعَلُهَا لِلَّذِينَ لَا يُرِيدُونَ عُلُوًّا فِي  
الْأَرْضِ وَلَا فَسَادًا وَالْعَاقِبَةُ لِلْمُتَّقِينَ ۝

*"That home of the hereafter we shall give to those who intend not high-handedness or mischief on earth. And the end is (best) for the righteous."* (al-Qasas: 83)

According to a *hadith*, a person asked the prophet (SAW), "What is meant by war in the way of Allah"? A person fights for wealth, the other for getting fame of bravery, the third person has enmity to a man or he fights for national bigotry. Whose war among these is in the way of Allah? The prophet (SAW) said, "None of these, ---- in the way of Allah is the war of only that person who fights without any purpose other than elevating Allah's words". According to another *hadith*, "One who fought with an intention of getting a camel's string lost his reward". Allah accepts only that work which is done to please Him, not for any personal or national cause. Thus the condition of *fi sabeelillah* for *jihad* is especially important according to the Islamic point of view<sup>1</sup>. As far as the *jihad* as such is concerned, it is done in the world by all living beings. Every one is using its full energy to achieve its goal. But the revolutionary group named as 'Muslim' has one most important and fundamental view of its revolutionary programme, that is 'use your life and wealth, fight all the rebellious powers of the world, consume all your physical and spiritual energies not to take place of other rebels but to cease rebellion and deluge, and to establish the rule of Allah on the earth.

After explaining in brief the concept of *jihad* and meaningfulness of *fi sabeelillah*, I want to deal a little with the call of Islam for revolution so that it could be well understood what is the need of *jihad* for this and what is its objective?

---

<sup>1</sup> This is another point where the people have committed a great mistake. They overlooked the difference between *jihad* and *jihad fi sabeelillah*. Therefore, the difference between the struggle for national supremacy and that for elevating the word of God could not be maintained.

## Islamic Call for Revolution

Islamic call for revolution, in brief, is as follows:

يَا أَيُّهَا النَّاسُ اعْبُدُوا رَبَّكُمُ الَّذِي خَلَقَكُمْ ۝

*"O ye people! Worship your guardian Lord, Who created you."*  
(*al-Baqarah: 21*)

Islam does not call workers or land lords, peasants or industrialists, it call all human beings. Its addressee is man as a human being and it says only that if you obey and follow the command of any one other than Allah, then leave it; and if you have any desire of godhood, then give up this also, because you have no right to make others obey you and bow their head before you. You should accept the obedience of One God and come on the same level in this obedience.

تَعَالَوْا إِلَىٰ كَلِمَةٍ سَوَاءٍ بَيْنَنَا وَبَيْنَكُمْ أَلَّا نَعْبُدَ إِلَّا اللَّهَ وَلَا  
نُشْرِكَ بِهِ شَيْئًا وَلَا يَتَّخِذَ بَعْضُنَا بَعْضًا أَرْبَابًا مِّنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ

*Say: "O people of the book! Come to common terms as between us and you: that we worship none but Allah: that we associate no partners with him: that we erect not, from among ourselves, Lords and patrons other than Allah."*  
(*Aal-e-Imran: 64*)

It was a call of universal and complete revolution. It loudly said, *إِنَّ الْحُكْمَ إِلَّا لِلَّهِ* ("The command rests with none but Allah"--- *Al-An'am: 57*). The right of judgment goes perfectly to Allah. The governance is for none but Allah. No one has any right to become the ruler of people of his own self and allow by his free choice to do any thing or refrain from any thing. Considering any person the master of permission or forbiddance is in fact making partners to Allah, and this is the main cause of disturbance in human society. The cause of the deflection of man from the nature on which Allah has created Him and from the way of life taught by Him is only that the he forgets Allah and



as a result disregards his own truth also. The necessary consequence of this is that on the one hand some people, dynasties or groups stand with hidden or open desire of becoming god and using their power make people subordinate, and on the other hand some other people out of the same forgetfulness of Allah and the self, accept the godhood of those powerful people and give them the right of command and then bow to their command. This is in the world the foundation of tyranny, disorder and exploitation. And Islam gives stroke to it first of all. Islam loudly says:

وَلَا تُطِيعُوا أَمْرَ الْمُسْرِفِينَ الَّذِينَ يُفْسِدُونَ فِي الْأَرْضِ وَلَا يُصْلِحُونَ ○

*"And follow not the bidding of those who are extravagant, who make mischief in the land and mend not (their ways)"* (al-Shu'ara: 151,152)

لَا تُطِيع مَنْ أَغْفَلْنَا قَلْبَهُ عَنْ ذِكْرِنَا وَاتَّبَعَ هَوَاهُ وَكَانَ أَمْرُهُ  
فُرْطَانًا ○

*"Nor obey any whose heart We have permitted to neglect the remembrance of Us, one who follows his own desire, and his affair has become all excess."* (al-Kahaf: 28)

إِنَّ لَعْنَةَ اللَّهِ عَلَى الظَّالِمِينَ ○ الَّذِينَ يَصُدُّونَ عَنْ سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ  
وَيَبْغُونَهَا عِوَجًا ○

*"The curse of Allah is on the wrong-doers; - Those who would hinder (men) from the path of Allah desiring to make something crooked:"* (al-A'raf: 44, 45)

It asks people, "Are many lords differing among themselves better, or Allah the One, Supreme and Irresistible". (*"a'arbaabum mutafariqun amillahil wahidil qahhaar"* --- Yusuf: 39). Is the obedience of these small and big gods in whose obedience you are being crushed is acceptable to you or the obedience of One Irresistible God? If you will not accept the obedience that One God,

you will never get rid of the mastery of these small gods, they will hold you any way and create disorder.

إِنَّ الْمُلُوكَ إِذَا دَخَلُوا قَرْيَةً أَفْسَدُوهَا وَجَعَلُوا أَعْرَءَ

أَهْلِهَا أَذِلَّةً وَكَذَلِكَ يَفْعَلُونَ ○

*"Kings when they enter a country, spoil it, and make the noblest of its people the meanest. Thus do they behave!"*

(*al-Naml: 34*)

وَإِذَا تَوَلَّى سَعَى فِي الْأَرْضِ لِيُفْسِدَ فِيهَا وَيُهْلِكَ الْحَرْثَ

وَالنَّسْلَ وَاللَّهُ لَا يُحِبُّ الْفُسَادَ ○

*"When he turns his back, his everywhere is to spread mischief through the earth and destroy crops and progeny. But Allah loveth not mischief."*

(*al-Baqarah: 205*)

It is not a proper place to give details. However, I want to remind in brief that the call of Islam for unity and worship of God was not an invitation like other religions, but in fact it was an invitation for social revolution. It directly attacked those groups which on the colour of religion had become priests, from the stage of politics had become kings, lords and masters, or on the level of economics had appeared as bankers, land lords and money lenders, and thus had made people their obedient. Somewhere they had openly become the lords other than Allah (*al-Taubah: 31*), demanded for their obedience based on their birth or class rights and clearly said 'there is none to worship but me', 'I am your greatest lord', 'I give you life and death', and 'who is more powerful than us'. Somewhere they took the benefit of people's ignorance and made gods in the form of idols and statues on the basis of which they made people accept their rights of obedience. Thus the call of Islam against paganism and idol worship, and its preaching for the *ibadah* of One God was directly opposed to the government and the objectives of those classes which either supported the government or

stood on the support of the government. That is why, whenever any prophet said, "O people do *ibadah* of Allah, there is none to be worshiped other than Him", at once the government of the time opposed and all unlawfully benefitted classes took arm against him. It was because Islam was not simply a metaphysical proposition; it was a declaration of societal revolution, and political tumult was smelt as soon as the first call to it was listened.

### **The Property of Islamic Call of Revolution**

There is no doubt that the messengers (AS) were all revolutionary leaders, and our chief Mohammad (SAW) is the greatest among them. But the attribute that clearly demarcates between the common leaders of the world and these God worshipping revolutionaries is that the formers may have good intentions but cannot reach the accurate position of justice and balance. Either they stand from depressed classes or with the sentiments of helping them and then look all the matters with the same angle. Consequently their view is not impartial and purely human, but has sentiments of rage and dislike to a group and favour to the other. They consider such a cure of injustice that is another injustice in retaliation. It is not possible for them to establish an alternative system free from the sentiments of revenge, envy and enmity, so that it may have welfare of whole humanity. In contrast to it, the messengers and their followers might have been heavily oppressed and treated unjustly but their revolutionary movement was not influenced by their personal sentiments. They worked directly under the guidance of God, and as God is always free from human emotions, they have neither special relation with any group of people nor any complaint or enmity with other class of people. All messengers (AS) viewed matters with

pure justice to make things beneficial to the people as a whole, to establish a system for keeping everyone within limits, make good use of his rights, and maintain a perfect balance in the relations between individuals on one hand and the individuals and groups on the other hand. That is why the revolutionary movement of messengers did not convert into class war. They did not begin social reconstruction to make a class rule over the other, but used such a method of justice in which equal chances were provided to all men for development, and material and spiritual dignity.

### **Need of *Jihad* and its Objective**

It is difficult to discuss at length the social order of Islam in this short discourse. These details will be presented elsewhere. Here keeping within the limits of the subject I had to explain that Islam is not simply a religious doctrine and a set of prayers but it is a comprehensive system which likes to dislodge all tyrannical and destructive systems of life from the world and establish in their place its own reformatory system which it considers best for the welfare and development of humanity.

For this destruction and reconstruction, revolution and reformation it does not invite a particular nation or group but calls the human beings. It calls the tyrant classes, exploitative groups, kings and chiefs also, "Come and accept to live within the allowed limits suggested by your Creator. If you will accept the system of justice and truth you will be in peace and safety. Here is no enmity with man, but it is with injustice, destruction, immorality, crossing the limits and trying to get what is by nature not his right. Those who accept this invitation become the members of Islamic *Jama'at* and thus an International revolutionary party comes into existence which the Quran

calls as *Hizbullah*, the other name being *Islami Jama'at* or *Ummatul Muslimah*.

As soon as this *Jama'at* comes into existence it begins to work hard (*jihad*) to obtain the objective of its existence. The very purpose of its existence is to try to finish non Islamic system of government and in contrast establish the government of that balanced system of civilization and society which is expressed in the Quran by the comprehensive word '*kalimatullah*' (word of Allah). If this party does not try to change the government its purpose of existence is denied because it has not been erected for any other purpose and there is no use of it other than to do this *jihad*. The Quran tells only one purpose of it as follows:

كُنْتُمْ خَيْرَ أُمَّةٍ أُخْرِجَتْ لِلنَّاسِ تَأْمُرُونَ بِالْمَعْرُوفِ وَ  
تَنْهَوْنَ عَنِ الْمُنْكَرِ وَتُؤْمِنُونَ بِاللَّهِ

*"Ye are the best of people, evolved for mankind. Enjoining what is right and forbidding what is wrong and believing in Allah."*  
(Aal-e-Imran: 110)

It is not the party of preachers and missionaries for propagation of religion, but it is the party of Allah's soldiers.

لِتَكُونُوا شُهَدَاءَ عَلَى النَّاسِ

*"That ye might be witness over the nations"*

(al-Baqara: 143)

And its responsibility is to eradicate injustice, mischief, destruction, immorality, rebellion and exploitation by using force. Finish the godhood of the lords other than Allah and establish righteousness in place of vice.

فَقَاتِلْهُمْ حَتَّى لَا تَكُونَ فِتْنَةً وَيَكُونَ الدِّينُ لِلَّهِ

*"And fight them on until there is no more persecution and the religion becomes Allah's."* (al-Baqarah: 193)

إِلَّا تَفْعَلُوهُ تَكُنْ فِتْنَةٌ فِي الْأَرْضِ وَفَسَادٌ كَبِيرٌ ۝

*"Unless ye do this, there would be tumult and oppression on earth, and great mischief."* (al-Anfal: 73)

هُوَ الَّذِي أَرْسَلَ رَسُولَهُ بِالْهُدَىٰ وَدِينِ الْحَقِّ لِيُظْهِرَهُ عَلَى

الدِّينِ كُلِّهِ وَلَوْ كَرِهَ الْمُشْرِكُونَ ۝

*"It is He Who has sent His messenger with guidance and the religion of truth. That He made it prevail over all religions, even though the pagans may detest (it)"*

(al-Saff: 9)

Thus there is no way for this party other than to take the government in hand because a destructive system of civilization stands only with the power of destructive government, and an honest system of civilization can never be established until and unless the government is taken from destructive people and transferred to the reformers.

Overlooking the world reform, it is impossible for this party to follow even its own way if the government rules the other way. A party which considers a system as true cannot pass its life according to its chosen way in the government of the other system. If a follower of socialism wants to live on the pattern of socialism in England or America he cannot be successful in his intention because the rule of capitalist system will be over his head by the force of government and he will not be able to prevent himself from the influence of its power. Similarly a Muslim cannot succeed if he wants to follow the Islamic system while living in non Islamic government. The laws which he considers false, the taxes which are unlawful according to him, the matters which he thinks not allowed, the way of life that is destructive for him, the fatal method of education, all will surround him, his households, his children in such a way that he will not be able to come out of their grip. Thus a man or group who believes in

particular way is bound by natural urge to eradicate the opposite government and establish the rule of his own way. It is because without it he cannot follow his way. His carelessness in this struggle clearly means that in fact he is not sincere in his doctrines.

عَفَا اللَّهُ عَنْكَ لِمَ أَذِنْتَ لَهُمْ حَتَّى يَتَبَيَّنَ لَكَ الَّذِينَ  
صَدَقُوا وَتَعْلَمَ الْكَاذِبِينَ ۝ لَا يَسْتَأْذِنُكَ الَّذِينَ يُؤْمِنُونَ  
بِاللَّهِ وَالْيَوْمِ الْآخِرِ أَنْ يُجَاهِدُوا بِأَمْوَالِهِمْ وَأَنْفُسِهِمْ... إِنَّمَا  
يَسْتَأْذِنُكَ الَّذِينَ لَا يُؤْمِنُونَ بِاللَّهِ وَالْيَوْمِ الْآخِرِ

*"God give thee grace! Why did you grant them exemption until those who told the truth were seen by you in a clear light, and you had proved the liars? Those who believe in Allah and the last day ask you for no exemption from fighting with their goods and persons..... Only those ask you for exemption who believe not in Allah and the last day," (al-Taubah: 43, 44)*

The Quran in these words has clearly ordained that the only measure of knowing the truth of a party is that it should do *jihad* with its goods and self to make its doctrine rule over the affairs. Your acceptance of the rule of a government opposed to your doctrine is a clear evidence of your falsehood in your belief and its natural consequence is and should be that finally your belief in the doctrine for name sake should also remain no more. In the beginning you will accept the opposite government with disgust, then slowly your hearts will become acquainted with it and then the disgust will change into likeness. Finally, a stage will come that you will help creating and keeping the opposite government, do *jihad* with your goods and self to create and establish the way of non Islam instead of Islam. Your energies will begin to be utilized against the stabilization of Islam. At this stage there will be no difference between you and unbelievers

except the hypocritical claim of Islam, a meanest lie and a deceptive name. The prophet *sallallahu alaihi wasallam* in a *hadith* has described this consequence in explicit words as follows:

والذى نفسى بيدهم لتأمرن بالمعروف ولتنهون عن المنكر  
ولتأخذن يد المسى ولتأطرنه على الحق اطراء اوليضرين  
الله قلوب بعضكم على بعض اوليعنكم كما لعنهم

*"By Allah in whose hands is my soul, either you will have to give order for the good and forbid from the wrong, hold the hands of wrong doers and turn it towards the right, or otherwise the consequence of the law of nature made by Allah will be that your hearts will also be influenced by the sinners and you will also become cursed like them".*

## A Universal Revolution

It might have become clear through this discourse that the objective of Islamic *jihad* is to dethrone non Islamic system of government and establish Islamic system of government in its place.

Islam wants this revolution to bring about not in one or some of the countries but throughout the world. Although to begin with, the duty of the members of Islamic party is to revolutionize the system of government wherever they live but their final objective is nothing but a world revolution. A revolutionary way which has been opted for the reform of humanity instead of a nation can never limit its viewpoint within the boundaries of a country or a nation but it is compelled by its nature to make universal revolution its objective. Truth refuses to accept geographical boundaries. It requires that if I am truth at this side of the river or the mountain I should also be truth on the other side. No part of humanity should be deprived of me. It is my duty to reach wherever deprivation,



injustice, tyranny and exploitation is found. The Quran expresses this viewpoint in the following words:

وَمَا لَكُمْ لَا تُقَاتِلُونَ فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ وَالْمُسْتَضْعَفِينَ مِنَ  
الرِّجَالِ وَالنِّسَاءِ وَالْوِلْدَانِ الَّذِينَ يَقُولُونَ رَبَّنَا أَخْرِجْنَا مِنْ  
هَذِهِ الْقَرْيَةِ الظَّالِمِ أَهْلُهَا ۝

*"And why should you not fight in the cause of Allah while those who, being weak, are ill-treated? Men women and children who cry, "Our Lord! Rescue us from this town whose people are oppressors". (al-Nisa: 75)*

Moreover, despite the national and country wise division, human relations among each other have such universality that a kingdom cannot perfectly follow its rules and principles so long as the neighbouring country also does not have the same rules and principles. That is why for a Muslim party it is necessary, for general reform and prevention of self, not to keep limited to establish the government of Islamic system in any one region but try to expand this system all around as far as her energies help her. She will on the one hand propagate her views and ideas in the world and invite people to accept the way in which their true welfare is implicit. On the other hand if she has power she will fight to dethrone non Islamic governments and establish Islamic system in their place.

This was the policy on which the prophet (SAW) and after him his righteous representatives (*Khulafa'-e-Raashideen*) acted. The Arab where the Muslim party evolved was first of all captured under Islamic government. After that the prophet (SAW) invited the neighbouring countries to his principle and way and did not wait to see if this invitation is accepted or not, but started encountering with Roman Empire as soon as he obtained power. Abu Bakr (RA) became the leader of the party after the prophet (SAW) and attacked both the non Islamic governments of Rome and Persia, and then Omar

(RA) concluded it till the Islamic party won over. The people of Egypt, Syria, Rome and Persia considered it the imperialist policy of Arabs in the beginning. They thought that now also a nation has come out like other nations before, to make others their slaves. Based on this misunderstanding the people gathered to fight Muslims under the flag of Caesar and Kisra. But when the truth of the Islamic revolutionary way was observed, and they came to know that these are not the flag holders of aggressive nationalism but are free from nationalist sentiments and have come to establish just system, there purpose is to eradicate the godhood of unjust classes which under the shade of Caesar and Kisra are ruining us, their moral sympathies tilted towards the Muslim party. They began separating from the flag of Caesar and Kisra, and if joined them out of compulsion they fought in a disheartened fashion. This was the only cause of miraculous victories of Muslims in the initial period. It was only because of this that the outsiders began joining the international party in large numbers as soon as they observed the Islamic system in action after the establishment of Islamic government. They stood as the flag holders of this way to expend it to other countries too.

### **Division of Offensive and Defensive is Irrelevant**

If you think over the above discussion you will easily understand that the division of battles in terms of offensive and defensive does not apply on Islamic *Jihad*. This division can apply only on the battles between nations and countries because the terms offense and defense are used in relation to these only. But when an international party stands with a universal point of view and a way of life, invites all nations to this way as human beings, gives entry to all nations with equity in the party

and works only to dethrone the governments of other viewpoints, there is no question of attack and defense in above terms. Even if the term is overlooked the division of offensive and defensive does not apply on Islamic *jihad*. Islamic *jihad* is both offensive and defensive simultaneously. It is offensive in the sense that the Muslim party attacks the government of opposite way of life. And it is defensive in the sense that she is compelled to gain the power of government to act according to its own way. As a party she has no home to protect by defense. She has with her only the rules and principles which she supports. Similarly she does not attack the home of opposite party but she attacks her rules and principles. The objective of this attack is not that they give up their principles under force. The only purpose is to snatch away their power of governance.

### **Position of *Zimmis***

From here itself, the question of the position of those people is solved who follow any other doctrine and way of life but live in the Islamic system of governance. Islamic *jihad* does not take into consideration the doctrine, way of thought, method of worship, and societal rules of other people. It provides full freedom to keep on any doctrine and follow any viewpoint. However it does not accept their right to run the government according to a way that is destructive in the eyes of Islam. It does not also allow dealing matters in the Islamic system in a way that is lethal to society according to Islam. For example it will bind up all forms of usury as soon as it takes the system in its hand, never allow gambling. It will stop all forms of sale purchase and money transaction which are blameworthy in Islam. It will completely close the brothels and centres of indecency. It will compel non

Muslim women to keep the least limits of covering the body parts (*satar*) and stop them from moving out with odd fashions of ignorant period (*tabarruj al-jahiliyyah*). It will keep strict censor on cinema and check all immoral presentations out. It will not allow co-education to any group. There are many other such matters of civilization which the Islamic government will not allow, not only for social welfare and development but also for its defense, even if they are allowed in non Muslim systems, but are the cause of distortion and disturbance in view of Islam.

If anybody blames Islam for being illiberal on this point, he should see that no revolutionary and reformative movement has been as liberal to others as is the Islam. In other systems you will find that the life is made difficult to other groups.<sup>1</sup> They are compelled to leave the country. But Islam gives full opportunity to them for growth and development and behaves them with commendable generosity without any parallel.

### Suspicion of Imperialism

I should repeat at this stage that in view of Islam, *jihad* is only that which is in the way of God, and that the Muslims are not allowed simply to dethrone Caesar and *Kisra* and take their place after the establishment of Islamic government. A Muslim does not fight and cannot fight as far as he is a Muslim to establish his own government, make the servants of God his slaves and erect paradises for him by exploiting the hard labour of people. This is not the *jihad* in the way of God but it is the *jihad* in the way of devil (*taghut*) and such a government has no connection to Islam. Islamic *jihad* is a dry, tasteless labour which has nothing except the sacrifice of

---

<sup>1</sup> Its most recent example is found in the socialist revolution of Russia, which has no parallel in tyranny and bloodshed throughout the history.

life, wealth and wishes. If this *jihad* succeeds and consequently the government comes in the hand then it lays on the head of a true Muslim ruler such a heavy load of responsibilities that even the rest of night and comfort of the day for this poor man becomes forbidden (*haram*), but in remuneration he cannot even make use of the pleasures of the rule for which generally the government is acquired. An Islamic ruler is not distinct and higher than the common people; he cannot sit on the throne of greatness and dignity, cannot make others to bow necks before him, cannot even shake a leaf against the *shari'ah*, he has no right to prevent his relatives, friends and even himself from the lawful petition of the meanest person of the state, he cannot take a grain or capture a piece of land unlawfully. It is unlawful for him to take salary from the government treasure (*baitulmaal*) more than enough for a middle class Muslim. That poor man can neither build glorified castles, nor keep attendants, servants, showy items and goods of comforts. Every time a fear overshadows him that his actions will be judged a day and if a single unlawful coin, a piece of land obtained by force, a tint of pride, a stain of tyranny and injustice, a shadow of lust could be recognized in his account, then he will have to get severe punishment. A truly greedy person will be ready to accept the heavy responsibility of being the head of an Islamic state only if he is simultaneously foolish, because the position of an ordinary shopkeeper of the market is better than the ruler of the Islamic government. He earns in the day more than the *Khalifah* and sleeps in the night with comfort without fear. The poor *khalifah* neither earns equal to him nor sleeps in night with rest and peace.

This is the most fundamental difference between the Islamic and the non Islamic governments. The ruler class

in a non Islamic government establishes its godhood and utilizes the resources of the country for itself. In contrast to it in Islamic government the ruler class simply serves and does not get for its self more than common people. Compare the salaries given to the civil services in an Islamic government either with today's imperialist governments or those of the same period. You will find a difference of spirit and substance between the world level expansion of Islam, and the universality of Imperialism. The salaries of the governors of Khorason, Iraq, Syria and Egypt in Islamic period were lesser than the salaries of your ordinary inspectors. The first caliph Hadrat Abu Bakr Siddique was the administrator of a great kingdom only for Rs.100/= per month. The salary of Hadrat Omar (RA) was not more than Rs. 150/= per month even though the state treasure (*baitul maal*) was full of the treasure left by the two empires of the world. Though apparently Imperialism also conquers the countries like Islam but there is a difference of sky and the earth between the substances of both.

“Both fly in the same horizon but + the world of the falcon is greatly different from the vulture.”

پرواز ہے دونوں کی اسی ایک فضا میں  
کرگس کا جہاں اور ہے شاہیں کا جہاں اور

This is the reality of *jihad* about which you have been listening a lot. Now if anybody asks me where that Islam has gone and why there is not even a tint of that Islam, where is the Muslim party and *jihad* among the Muslims of the whole world which you are talking about? I will request not to ask me this question. But ask this to those who have distracted Muslims from their true mission and diverted them to amulets (*ta'weez*), charms (*gandon*), rituals, meditations and contemplations; who proposed

short cuts for salvation, welfare and achievement of goals so that everything may be obtained without labour and hard work only by moving rosary or pleasing the dweller of a grave; who wrapped the principles, rules and objective of Islam and threw them in dark corners and entangled the Muslim minds in discussions like 'saying *aameen* loudly' (*aameen bil jahr*), 'raising hands' (*rafh'i yadain*), 'sending gifts to the dead' (*eesali thawab*), visiting graves and many other such activities because of which Muslims completely forgot their own selves, their responsibility, their purpose of creation and the reality of Islam. If you are not satisfied, then ask those commanders and governors who claim to believe in the Quran and Muhammad (SAW) but do not accept the right of the law of Quran and the guidance of the prophet more than to occasionally arrange programs for reading the Quran, celebrate birth anniversary of the prophet (SAW) and (we seek refuge of Allah) sometimes admire Allah *Miyan* for His poetry. As far as the factual establishment of Islamic law is concerned, these people consider themselves free of this duty because in fact their lust is never ready to accept those punctualities and to sustain the load of those responsibilities which Islam lays on them. They want very low-priced salvation.

*Tarjumanul Quran, Rabiulawwal, 1358 A.H; May, 1939 A.C.*

## Islamic Concept of Freedom

One of our friends says:

“There is an important doubt in the event of Hadrat Zaid bin Haritha and *Hadrat Zainab* referred in the Quran, *Surah Ahzab*. The prophet (SAW) said, **أَمْسِكْ عَلَيْكَ زَوْجَكَ وَاتَّقِ اللَّهَ** “Keep your wife with you and fear Allah” (*Al-Ahzab: 37*). But *Hadrat Zaid* (RA) disobeyed the prophet (SAW) and divorced his wife. There is no doubt that this action was against the command, yet there is not a single implicit or explicit hint in the Quran to the effect that this act of *Hadrat Zaid* was considered unpleasant by Allah. In spite, the narration of the event begins with, **يَلِدِي أَنْعَمَ اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ** “Whom Allah rewarded” (*Al-Ahzab: 37*). This creates a doubt that the order of the prophet may also be disobeyed. A proven command of the prophet is not as commendable as is the command of Allah”.

There is no complexity in the question. The doubt can be removed in few words. But in fact the place where the doubt begins is the springhead of many long-chained misunderstandings. Therefore, it is better to hint at its origin and discuss its branches to remove the doubt.

The wise Quran more explicitly than all other heavenly books declares that the absolute commander is none other than Allah **إِنَّ الْحُكْمَ إِلَّا لِلَّهِ** (*al-An'am: 57*), Allah may give any command **إِنَّ اللَّهَ يَحْكُمُ مَا يُرِيدُ** (*Maida:1*), whatever he does cannot be questioned **لَا يَسْتَلْ عَمَّا يُفْعَلُ** (*al-Anbiya: 23*), only His obedience is compulsory because man has been created obedient **وَمَا خَلَقْتُ الْجِنَّ وَالْإِنْسَ إِلَّا لِيَعْبُدُونِ** (*al-Zaryat: 56*), man is neither the creature of other than Him nor servant nor nourished by other than Allah **يَقُولُونَ هَلْ لَنَا مِنَ الْأَمْرِ مِنْ شَيْءٍ وَقُلْ إِنَّ الْأَمْرَ كُلَّهُ لِلَّهِ** (*Aal-e-Imran: 54*). Any man has no absolute authority on



other man and nobody has been compelled to obey the other man only on the basis that it is his order. This right goes to Allah alone.

Main purpose of revelation of the Quran is to throw away the band of obedience of any one other than Allah from the neck of man and provide him freedom of opinion and conscience after making him servant of Allah, the real Sovereign. Thus the book which has wedged greatest war against human slavery is the Quran. This book does not confirm to the right of any person's declaration of any thing as allowed to be considered allowed as such, and considered *haram* any thing declared *haram* by him, and that his affirmative or negative command should be followed as if he is God. The Quran considers this type of following and obedience as partnership to God and counts as idol worshippers, those who treat their *ulama*, preachers, *pundits*, family priests and commanders of the world as gods other than Allah. It is because that whenever a person will follow another person in this way, there will necessarily be the sentiment of godhood and slavery working behind it. A man totally surrenders to another man his freedom of heart and mind, spirit and body only when he considers him free of mistake and defects; the knower of the part and the whole; or considers him personally rightful to give command of yes or no and has a natural right to command; or that he is in fact the source of benefit and harm, providence and maintenance. Considering any person other than God equipped with these attributes is the root of idol worship and slavery. And Unity (*tawhid*) ----- whose necessary consequence is freedom ----- is to consider all things beside God devoid of these attributes and to refuse to their right of commandment.

Keeping this primary rule in mind, now investigate what is the importance of following the command of the prophet on which the *deen* is based and which has been made duty bound? This obedience is never because that the prophet is a particular person like Ibn Imran, Ibn Maryam or Ibn Abdullah and in the capacity of that particular person he has the right of saying yes or no and declaring allowed (*halal*) or not allowed (*haram*). With this (I seek refuge of Allah), the prophet will himself belong to the category of gods other than God and the objective for which he has been made prophet will perish. The Quran has made this problem highly explicit and clearly doubtless. It says that the prophet in his personage is man (*bashar*) like you *قُلْ سُبْحَانَ رَبِّيَ هَلْ كُنْتُ إِلَّا بَشَرًا رَسُولًا* (*Bani Israel: 93*), Say, my *Rabb* is pure, am I something more than a man who has been made a messenger?). And their messengers said to them, *وَقَالَتْ لَهُمْ رُسُلُهُمْ إِنَّا نَحْنُ إِلَّا بَشَرٌ مِثْلُكُمْ* "We are none but men like you" (*Ibrahim: 11*). However, in the capacity of a prophet there is great difference between him and you. When prophethood is given to him by God, he is also given the authority to give order. These are those whom We have given the Book, command (*hukm*) and prophethood, *أُولَئِكَ الَّذِينَ آتَيْنَاهُمُ الْكِتَابَ وَالْحُكْمَ وَالنَّبُوءَةَ* (*al-An'am: 89*). Command (*hukm*) connotes both judgment and authority. Thus the commanding right of the prophet is not his own, but it is an ordained to him in the capacity of a messenger. Therefore, his obedience is in fact the obedience of God. One who obeyed the prophet, actually obeyed Allah. *مَنْ يُطِيعِ الرَّسُولَ فَقَدْ أَطَاعَ اللَّهَ* (*al-Nisa:80*). He is sent with the purpose of establishing the commands of God and you have to follow these commands. We have sent every messenger but to be obeyed by the permission of Allah, *وَمَا أَرْسَلْنَا مِنْ رَسُولٍ إِلَّا لِيُطَاعَ بِإِذْنِ اللَّهِ* (*al-Nisa:64*). His command as a messenger is the command of Allah and nobody has

any right of questioning it.

وَمَنْ يُشَاقِقِ الرَّسُولَ مِنْ بَعْدِ مَا بَيَّنَّ لَهُ الْهُدَىٰ وَيَتَّبِعْ غَيْرَ سَبِيلِ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ نُوَلِّهِ مَا تَوَلَّىٰ وَنُصْلِهِ جَهَنَّمَ ۖ وَسَاءَتْ مَصِيرًا

*If anyone contends with the messenger even after guidance has been plainly conveyed to him, and follows a path other than that of the men of faith, We shall also turn him to the path he has chosen, and lend him in the hell, - what an evil refuge!* (al-Nisa: 115).

Keep action aside, even if a thought of disobedience of the prophet comes in heart, the belief goes at once.

فَلَا وَرَبِّكَ لَا يُؤْمِنُونَ حَتَّىٰ يُحَكِّمُوكَ فِيمَا شَجَرَ بَيْنَهُمْ ثُمَّ لَا يَجِدُوا فِيْٓ أَنفُسِهِمْ حَرَجًا مِّمَّا قَضَيْتَ وَيُسَلِّمُوا تَسْلِيمًا

*But no, by your Lord, they can have no (real faith), until they make you judge in all disputes between them. And their souls have no resistance against your decision, but they accept it with the fullest conviction...* (al-Nisa: 65).

يَوْمَئِذٍ يُوَدِّعُ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا وَعَصُوا الرَّسُولَ وَلَوْ تُسَوَّىٰ بِهِمُ الْأَرْضُ

*And the consequence of this disobedience is a permanent loss* (al-Nisa: 42).

As pointed out above that this perfect obedience and surrender on which belief and religion is based and about which it has been explicitly declared that the guidance is purely based upon the obedience of the prophet *وَإِنْ تُطِيعُوهُ تَهْتَدُوا* (al-Noor: 42), the reference of this obedience is not the prophet in his self as a man. Allah had not sent any messenger for making people his obedient slaves instead of Allah, but He has sent him to make them obey His command.

مَا كَانَ لِبَشَرٍ أَنْ يُؤْتِيَهُ اللَّهُ الْكِتَابَ وَالْحُكْمَ وَالنَّبُوءَةَ ثُمَّ يَقُولَ لِلنَّاسِ كُونُوا عِبَادًا لِّيْ مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ وَلَكِنْ كُونُوا رَبَّانِيِّينَ

*It is not (possible) that a man to whom is given the book and wisdom and the prophetic office should say to people: "Be ye my worshippers rather than Allah's" On*

*the contrary (he would say): "Be ye worshippers of Him (Who is truly the cherisher of all) ...." (Aale Imran: 79)*

He did not come to compel the people to follow his personal wishes, force them to accept his greatness and grandeur, press them in his personal power-rack to the extent that they become powerless and give up their right of opinion against him, and totally put off their heart and mind before him. This would be the same worship of idols which the messenger is sent to cease. The purpose of the office of prophet is that he should cut through the bands which the people have fastened to the necks of other people وَيَضَعُ عَنْهُمْ إِصْرَهُمْ وَالْأَغْلَالَ الَّتِي كَانَتْ عَلَيْهِمْ (Al-A'raf: 156). The prophet is given his office to withhold those privileges which the people have taken in their hands to declare, of their own, the rights and duties of people and establish their own limits to declare for others the things allowed or prohibited.

وَلَا تَقُولُوا لِمَا تَصِفُ أَلْسِنَتُكُمُ الْكَذِبَ هَذَا حَلَالٌ وَهَذَا حَرَامٌ

*But say not for any false thing that your tongues may put forth, "This is lawful, and this is forbidden, (al-Nahl: 116)*

The office of the messenger is established only to relieve man from the wretchedness of bowing his neck before the decision of other men.

وَلَا يَتَّخِذْ بَعْضُنَا بَعْضًا أَرْبَابًا مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ

*That we erect not, from among ourselves, lords and patrons other than Allah (Aale Imran: 64)*

Then, how it could be lawful that the prophet should put his band in the necks of people in place of others band, snatch away the rights of others to make things lawful or unlawful and take these rights in his hand, and sit on the stage of tyrannical rule in place of others. He himself rebuked Jews and Christians for making their scholars and priests gods other than God. Then how he

could have said, "You make me god in place of God and obey my lust"?

That is why Allah *Ta'ala*, time and again says to His messengers to proclaim the truth that the obedience made compulsory to a believer and which is the basis of faith and from which a believer has no right to divert even a little (refusal or denial is graver than this), is not in fact the obedience of the messenger as a man but it is the obedience of the messenger in the capacity of messenger. It means that it is the obedience of the knowledge, guidance, command and the law of God which the messenger conveys to God's servants. Thus in fact the band of obedience in which Islam binds a man is not the obedience of a man but it is the obedience of God.

إِنَّا أَنْزَلْنَا إِلَيْكَ الْكِتَابَ بِالْحَقِّ لِتَحْكُمَ بَيْنَ النَّاسِ بِمَا أَرَاكَ اللَّهُ

*"We have sent down to thee the Book in truth, that thou mightiest judge between men, as guided by Allah: so be not (used) as an advocate by those who betray their trust; "*  
(*al-Nisa: 105*)

وَمَنْ لَّمْ يَحْكَمْ بِمَا أَنْزَلَ اللَّهُ فَأُولَئِكَ هُمُ الظَّالِمُونَ

*"And if any fail to judge by (the light of) what Allah hath revealed, they are (No better than) wrong-doers"*  
(*al-Maida: 45*)

As other people are tied in this *ayah*, the prophets are also bound.

إِنْ أَتَيْتُ إِلَّا مَا يُوحَىٰ إِلَيَّ

*"I but follow what is revealed to me"* (*al-An'am: 50*)

These and many other *ayaat* point to the fact that obedience is in fact for The Almighty God, and Islam has come to rout the obedience of other than God and finish the godhood of men over men. There is no obedience of man as a man in Islam. Obedience of the messenger is only because he has been given order by Allah. Obedience

of commanders is because they are to apply the command of Allah. Obedience of scholars (*ulama*) is because they teach and explain what is allowed or forbidden by Allah and His messenger. If anybody of them presents the command of God, it is incumbent on a Muslim to bow his head. He has no right to say if or but in it. He has no freedom of thought and autonomy of opinion contrary to God's command. But it is not mandatory for a Muslim to obey if anybody presents his own view. He has the right of freely thinking of his own and presenting his opinion. He has right to freely accept or differ. This is not only in case of scholars and commanders, but also, there is no barrier to differ even with the personal view of a messenger.

A part of prophet's (SAW) mission was to put the band of God's obedience in the necks of people. The other part was to throw away the band of man's obedience from their necks. Both were included in the purpose of his prophetic office and both were equally important. For the accomplishment of the first it was necessary that he should compel all Muslims to obey him unconditionally. It was because that Allah's obedience was based on his obedience. Compared to it, for the accomplishment of the second part it was equally important first of all, to settle the fact in Muslim minds through the prophet's own action that it is not necessary for them to follow anybody even Mohammad (SAW) ibn Abdullah in the capacity of a man and that their souls are completely free from obedience of men. In fact it was a very delicate task. Two ranks, one of the prophet and the other of a man, were present together in the same personality and they could not be distinguished with a clear line of demarcation. But the holy prophet of Allah brilliantly performed this task with the help of Allah's ordained wisdom. On the one

hand he, in the capacity of prophet, made to perform such obedience that was done nowhere for any commander in world history. And on the other hand, in the capacity of a man, he taught his devoted followers such a freedom of opinion that the greatest democrat of the world did not provide to his servants. One should reflect on how great authority as a prophet he had over his followers and how deep faith the Muslims had with him, and then look at how he used to keep separate his capacity of a prophet and a man during social relations and dealings with his companions? One should also reflect upon the fact that along with making his companions unconditionally obedient to himself in the capacity of prophet, how he offered complete freedom of opinion, and how he encouraged them differ even from his own opinion as a man? One will have to accept in the light of these facts that such a perfect self discipline, this wonderful power of distinction and such a complete insight can be found only in a prophet. Here it seems as if the human capacity of the prophet despite being separate has vanished in his prophetic capacity. The prophet in the capacity of man also serves his prophetic duties. He blows the spirit of free opinion in them and trains them according to the principles of democracy when he works as a man. He teaches them how should they utilize their free opinion against a man and tells them they have this freedom against every person. They are free to opine even before that perfect man and grand personality whose highest authority as a prophet they are bound to accept. If such a great authority on people is available to a non prophet, he will surely make them his slaves and impose upon them his rights like those which have been shown by spiritual guides, priests and emperors in the world. The prophet (SAW) says:

انما انا بشر اذا امرتكم بشئ من دينكم فخذوا به واذا  
امرتكم بشئ من رأي فانما انا بشر.

*"I am also a human being. Obey me when I command you in your religion (deen). And if I say something out of my opinion, I am a human being".*

Once, the prophet (SAW) gave a suggestion to the gardeners of Medina about the cultivation of date palms. People practiced accordingly but it did not prove beneficial. When he was told about it he said:

انى انما ظننت ظنا ولا تؤاخذونى بالظن ولكن اذا  
حدثتكم عن الله شيئا فخذوا به فانى لم اكذب على الله.

*"I only expressed my view. Do not ponder upon my words based on guess and opinion. But seize to anything I convey from God because I have said nothing wrong about God".*

The place where the prophet (SAW) fixed his tent first in the battle of Badr was not suitable. *Hadrat* Khabbab bin Munzir asked him, "Whether this place has been selected out of revelation or it is simply a trick of battle"? The prophet replied, "It was not based on revelation". Then he opined to lay the tent on another place. The prophet accepted his opinion and acted accordingly.

The prophet (SAW) called a meeting of his companions to seek opinion about the prisoners of Badr and also gave his opinion like a member of the committee. *Hadrat* Omar differed without hesitation in this meeting from the opinion of the prophet and Abu Bakr. This is an event famous in all the books of history. In the same meeting the prophet (SAW) asked his companions about his son in law to give back his necklace taken as compensation. He did not give the necklace back to him before seeking permission of the companions.



The prophet (SAW) wanted to make peace treaty with Bani Ghatfaan at the time of the battle of trench. Seniors of *Ansar* said if it is because of revelation we can't dare to speak, but if you want to do it by your opinion we differ. He accepted their opinion and tore himself the script of the treaty.

All Muslims at the time of Hudaibiya were not pleased with the treaty which was apparently disgusting. *Hadrat* Omar openly differed. But as soon as the prophet told that he was doing it in the light of revelation no one dared to utter a word though they were all worried. *Hadrat* Omar recompensed till last in different ways for he differed in a matter which was being done in the capacity of prophet.

*Ansar* of Medina expressed anger when the prophet (SAW) showed generosity in distributing the booty of Hunain's battle to win the hearts of new converts (*Mu'allifatul Qulub*). The prophet called them and did not say, "I am prophet, therefore, I can do any thing I like", but delivered a speech like the leader of a democratic government. He did not appeal to their faith but to their mind and sentiments so that they returned after full satisfaction.

This kind of treatment was with the people of higher status in the society. The prophet blew the spirit of strong opinion even among slave men and women. Bareerah was a slave woman who hated her husband who loved her at the depth of heart and ran weeping after her. The prophet (SAW) said to her, "It would be better if you had reunited with her husband". She asked if it was your order Sir! He answered, "Not an order but a recommendation". She answered, "If it is a recommendation, I do not want to go back to him".

There are many other such examples which tell us when, either by context or by the prophet's explicit words, the people came to know that he is saying something out of his opinion, they freely opined and he encouraged them. Differing at such occasions was not only allowed but he liked it and even withdrew himself.

Now we return to the case of *Hadrat Zaid* (RA) from where we started the discussion. He had various types of relations with the prophet (SAW). One relation was that the prophet was his guide and he was his pupil. Second relation was that of the in-laws. Third relation was that the prophet was the cherisher and he was cherished. There was no coordination between him and his wife. He expressed the intention of divorce. The prophet gave the same advice that an in-law and a cherisher would have given him i.e. fear God and do not divorce your wife. But *Hadrat Zaid* could have felt more than any other person, about the intensity of repulsion and hate that had taken place between the husband and wife due to difference of temperaments. It was not a matter of his religion and faith, but it was the case of his personal feeling. Therefore, he did not accept the advice of the prophet and divorced her wife. This was not the disobedience of the prophet; also he did not advise him as a prophet. Therefore, neither he became angry nor God. If there was, in place of the prophet (SAW) some other person who had nourished someone since childhood, variously favoured him, and in the last had married his sister with him despite the stigma of slavery, and he would have divorced his sister against his advice, he would have become surely angry. But he was not only a cherisher and in-law, he was a prophet also. And as a prophet his duty was to liberate men from the slavery of men, a right which the people had lost for long. That is why he did not pass the order but only

advised and never became angry when the advice was not followed. This expresses the fact that the capacity of the prophet and that of the man in him were separate as well as together. Such a wonderful balance in the use of these capacities can be maintained only by a prophet. Even as a man he acted in such a way that the responsibilities of a prophet were fulfilled side by side.

Seeds of the freedom of thought sown by the esteemed office of prophet, and the lesson of obedience to the commands of Allah and free opinion regarding human opinion, taught by the prophet to his companions through his own model made the companions most obedient to the command of God and most liberal and democratic otherwise. They did not scarify their freedom of opinion before greatest person. It was far beyond their mind set to consider any opinion above their critique only because it was the opinion of a great man. The great men among them whom they themselves considered great and whose greatness a world is confirming today also, they did not accept even their opinion merely because of their greatness but freely rejected and also confirmed. The pious caliphs (RA) after the prophet (SAW) favoured most this freedom of thought. Following the model of their Master (SAW) they did not only tolerate people's freedom but also encouraged it, and did not ask the weakest man to obey them without question only because they were great.

After the noble caliphs, *Banu Umayya* (Umayyad) and *Banu Abbas* (Abbasids) tried every way to squeeze the freedom of thought through fear, greed, tyranny and rewards but the spirit of freedom continued for a long time in the followers of companions and later generations of Muslims. You will find glittering examples of it during the first two to three centuries of Islamic history. Freedom

before the governors and ministers is comparatively a very little thing. Greatest evidence of the freedom of soul and mind is that a person should refuse to blindly imitate those whom he respects and venerates at the core of heart, and should think freely before them and maintains his opinion without restraint. We find the same spirit in the scholars of that period. Who will be nobler than the respected companions? And who will be more respectful to them compared to their followers (تبعه) ? But these people critically evaluated the opinions of the companions, gave judgment on their differences and leaving one's opinion accepted the other's. How frankly Imam Malik says: "Opinions of the companions are right as well as wrong, think and decide yourself". Similarly Imam Abu Haneefa says, "Between two differing statements one will surly be wrong".

These respected companions did never claim to be free from mistake so that you follow only our opinion by suspending your own thought and judgment. Whenever Sir Abu Bakr Siddique said something out of his estimate also said, "This is my view, if it is correct it is from Allah, if wrong then it is my mistake and I ask forgiveness from Him". *Hadrat* Omar used to say, "Do not make the mistake of opinion the *sunnah* for the *ummah*.

*Hadrat* Ibn Masood says, "Lo! One should not blindly imitate the other person in the matter of *deen*; if that person became the believer he also accepted the faith, and if he rejected, he also rejected belief".

Imam Malik says, "I am a man. My opinion may be wrong and also right. Ponder upon my opinion and accept what is according to the Quran and *sunnah* and leave what you find against these. An event of Imam Malik is a part of history. The Abbasid caliph Mansoor wanted to make his book "*Mu'atta*" the constitution of Islamic world. His

opinion was to establish the *Malikiyya* Law and dismiss all other laws. But the *Imam* himself stopped him because he did not want to kill the right of other's research and freedom of opinion and effort.

Imam Yusuf used to say, "Nobody is allowed to accept our saying so long as he does not know about our source".

Imam Shafa'i said, "Example of a person who obtains knowledge without evidence is like one who collects wood in night. He takes the bundle of wood but does not know there is also a snake in it".

The spirit of research and effort, freedom of thought and observation, and liberal inquiry of truth nurtured by the prophet among his companions, continued among Muslims with full glitter and glory up to three centuries. Afterwards the oppression of governors, commanders, scholars and preachers began to eat up this spirit. Right of thought from thinking minds, that of observation by observing eyes and the right of speech from the speaking tongue was snatched away. Muslims were officially trained for slavery right from courts to schools and monasteries; the slavery of heart and mind, soul and body overwhelmed them.

Courtiers introduced slavery to the minds through making people bow and prostrate, *madrassa* men poisoned minds by worship of big personalities. Masters of monasteries spoiled the spirit of initiation (*sunnat al-bai't*) and put such a 'holy' band in the necks of Muslims that no band harder and heavier than this would have ever been invented by man for men. When the heads begin to bow to ground before others than God, hands are hold before men as if standing in *salat*, beholding others with raised glance is considered as disrespect, hands and feet of human beings are kissed; man becomes the master and

cherisher (*unn data*), he is declared free to give orders without care and need of the certificate of Quran and *sunnah*, considered free of mistake, weakness and defect; when the command of man, even if not in faith, but in action is considered necessary to be obeyed as if it was the command of God, then believe with surety that the faces have been turned away from the guidance as has been observed in the words ----

أَلَا نَعْبُدُ إِلَّا اللَّهَ وَلَا نُشْرِكُ بِهِ شَيْئًا وَلَا يَتَّخِذَ بَعْضُنَا  
بَعْضًا أَرْبَابًا مِّنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ

*"that we worship none but Allah; that we associate no partner with Him; that we erect not, from among ourselves, Lords and patrons other than Allah"*

(Aal-e Imran: 64)

**Tarjumanul Quran, Ramadan, 1355; December, 1936**

## Liberalism

If a person claims something to be black, the other white; the third man judges the same thing to be yellow and fourth red, then it is not possible that all the four will be right. If a person says that an act is bad while the other calls it right; one stops from it while the other orders to do, it can never be possible that the opinion of both should be correct and true and both despite differing about permission and forbiddance of the same act should be right in their judgment. A person who confirms to these opposite views and declares both of them right, his matter will not be lacking any one of the two things. Either he wants to please all, or he has not given any thought to the matter and has opined without thinking properly. Anyway, both situations are against reason and truth, and it is not reasonable for any intelligent and truth-loving person to confirm to differing people whatever be the cause.

Generally people have fallen prey to the mistake that considering ten differing people and their opinions to be right is "liberalism". In fact it is not liberalism, it is but hypocrisy. Liberalism means to tolerate the beliefs and opinions of others if they are wrong in our understanding, criticize them not in ways of hurting their sentiments and not force them to revert from their beliefs and stop them from their actions. Providing space and freedom of belief and action with this patience and adopting this method is not only good but also necessary to keep peace among differing groups. But if despite keeping a belief we confirm to other's beliefs only to please them, despite following a framework of activity say to the follower of the other framework that you are all right, then this hypocritical opinion can never be called liberalism.

Expediently keeping silence and deliberate lie should have some difference. Correct liberalism is that which has been taught to us in Islam. We have been asked:

وَلَا تَسُبُّوا الَّذِينَ يَدْعُونَ مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ فَيَسُبُّوا اللَّهَ  
عَدْوًا بِغَيْرِ عِلْمٍ كَذَلِكَ زَيْنًا لِكُلِّ أُمَّةٍ عَمَلُهُمْ ثُمَّ إِلَىٰ  
رَبِّهِمْ مَرْجِعُهُمْ فَيُنَبِّئُهُمْ بِمَا كَانُوا يَعْمَلُونَ ○

*"Revile not ye those whom they call upon besides Allah, lest they out of spite revile Allah in their ignorance. Thus We have made alluring to each people its own doings. In the end will they return to their Lord and He shall then tell them the truth of all that they did. (Al-An'am: 108)*

وَالَّذِينَ لَا يَشْهَدُونَ الزُّورَ وَإِذَا مَرُّوا بِاللَّغْوِ مَرُّوا كِرَامًا ○

*"Those who witness<sup>1</sup> no falsehood, and if they pass by futility, they pass by it with honourable avoidance"*

*(Al-Furqn: 72)*

قُلْ يَا أَيُّهَا الْكَافِرُونَ ○ لَا أَعْبُدُ مَا تَعْبُدُونَ ○ وَلَا أَنْتُمْ عِبِدُونَ  
مَا أَعْبُدُ ○ وَلَا أَنَا عَابِدٌ مَّا عَبَدْتُمْ ○ وَلَا أَنْتُمْ عِبِدُونَ مَا  
أَعْبُدُ ○ لَكُمْ دِينُكُمْ وَلِيَ دِينِ ○

*Say: O ye that reject faith! I worship not that which ye worship, nor will ye worship that which I worship. And I will not worship that which ye have been wont to worship. Nor will ye worship that which I worship.*

*(Al-Kafirun: 1-6)*

لَا إِكْرَاهَ فِي الدِّينِ

*Let there be no compulsion in religion (Al-Baqara: 256)*

<sup>1</sup> Every action against truth is included in the definition of falsehood. Every place where paganism is observed, opinions on idol-worship are expressed, shamelessness is common, tyranny and transgression is a habit, is in fact a place of falsehood. There is nothing other than falsehood at a place where a man or any other creature is worshiped. This is the vast concept of lie. Not to witness lie means not to visit intentionally those places where a believer may have chance to observe such activities and be the witness to them.



وَيَذَرُونَ بِالْحَسَنَةِ السَّيِّئَةَ وَمِمَّا رَزَقْنَاهُمْ يُنفِقُونَ ○ وَإِذَا  
 سَمِعُوا اللَّغْوَ أَعْرَضُوا عَنْهُ وَقَالُوا لَنَا أَعْمَالُنَا وَلَكُمْ  
 أَعْمَالُكُمْ سَلَامٌ عَلَيْكُمْ لَا نَبْتَغِي الْجَاهِلِينَ ○

*That they avert Evil with Good and that they spent (in charity) out of what we have given to them. And when they hear vain talk, they turn away there from and say: "To us our deeds and to you yours; peace be to you: we seek not the ignorant."* (Al-Qasas: 54, 55)

فَلِذَلِكَ فَادُعُ ۖ وَاسْتَغِمْ كَمَا أُمِرْتَ ۖ وَلَا تَتَّبِعْ أَهْوَاءَ هُمْ ۖ  
 وَقُلْ آمَنْتُ بِمَا أَنْزَلَ اللَّهُ مِنْ كِتَابٍ وَأُمِرْتُ لِأَعْدِلَ بَيْنَكُمْ  
 اللَّهُ رَبُّنَا وَرَبُّكُمْ لَنَا أَعْمَالُنَا وَلَكُمْ أَعْمَالُكُمْ لَا حُجَّةَ بَيْنَنَا  
 وَبَيْنَكُمْ ۖ اللَّهُ يَجْمَعُ بَيْنَنَا وَإِلَيْهِ الْمَصِيرُ ○

*Now then, for that (reason), call (them to the faith), and stand steadfast as thou art not commanded, nor follow thou their vain desires; but say: "I believe in whatever book of Allah has sent down; and I am commanded to judge justly between you. Allah is our Lord and your Lord! For us (is the responsibility for) our deeds, and for you for your deeds. There is no contention between us and you. Allah will bring us together, and to Him is (our) final goal."* (Al-Shura: 15)

أَدْعُ إِلَى سَبِيلِ رَبِّكَ بِالْحُكْمَةِ وَالْمَوْعِظَةِ الْحَسَنَةِ وَ  
 جَادِلْهُمْ بِالَّتِي هِيَ أَحْسَنُ

*Invite (all) to the way of thy Lord with wisdom and beautiful preaching; and argue with them in ways that are best.* (Al-Nahl: 125)

This is that liberalism which a truth loving, right seeking and sound reasoned man can adopt. He will stand firm to the way he considers right, will clearly state and also invite others to his belief, but never hurt any heart, never use harsh words, will not attack other's beliefs, will not cause hindrance to others way of worships and activities, and will not try to drag others to his own way

by force. As for knowingly refusing to declare anything right to be right or knowingly calling anything wrong to be right, can never be an act of a truthful man. And doing this only to please others is especially a worst type of flattery. This is not only morally wretched but also does not succeed in the objective for which a man bends over himself down to such a low level. Clear and true judgment of the Quran is:

وَلَنْ تَرْضَىٰ عَنْكَ الْيَهُودُ وَلَا النَّصَارَىٰ حَتَّىٰ تَتَّبِعَ مِلَّتَهُمْ  
 قُلْ إِنَّ هُدَى اللَّهِ هُوَ الْهُدَىٰ وَلَئِنْ اتَّبَعْتَ أَهْوَاءَهُمْ بَعْدَ  
 الَّذِي جَاءَكَ مِنَ الْعِلْمِ مَا لَكَ مِنَ اللَّهِ مِنْ وَلِيٍّ وَلَا نَصِيرٍ ۝

*"Never will the Jews or the Christians be satisfied with thee unless thou follow their form of religion. Say: "The guidance of Allah, - that is the only guidance." Wert thou to follow their desire after the knowledge which hath reached to thee, then wouldst thou find neither protector nor helper against Allah."* (Al-Baqara: 120)

False liberalism is expressed for political purpose, and nowadays it is supposed "allowed" because a trench has been developed between morality and politics by the western political masters. But the condition of those researchers is very sad who, without giving any thought and using minds, present the view of their research that "all religions are true". And these words are uttered by those who claim that we do not speak a single word, nor accept anything so long as we do not test it by the rule of reason. As far as the rule of reason is concerned it is not ready to give weight to their research even equal to a wing of moth. The religions certified at once as true have a clear difference as of white and black in their principles. One claims that God is one; the other says it is two, the third tells them to be three. Fourth says that there are many powers joined together in godhood. Fifth has no concept of God in its teachings. Is it possible that all the

five be true? One raises man to the level of God; the other brings down God among people, third calls man as servant (*'abd*) and God as Master and Lord, the third is devoid of the concept of servant and Master. Can there be any space in truth to adjust all the four together? One keeps salvation dependent only upon action; the other considers faith enough for it, the third conditions salvation with both the faith and action. Shall all these three be true at once? One points to the way of salvation out of the world and its life. According to the other, the way of salvation passes through the world and its life. Should both of these ways be equally true? If anything certifying such opposites as true is named as reason, then the entity claiming impossibility of marriage between opposites should be named otherwise.

It is sad that the people equipped with superfluous judgment do not try to reach the truth of those concepts which are supposed to be common in religions, and derive wrong inferences based on the apparent similarities and wrong arrangement of some wrong premises. Though this similarity points to an important truth i.e. the origin of all religions is one. All these views and teachings spring out of one source. There is one source of knowledge which has introduced these truths to men living in different countries at different times and in different languages. There is an insight received by people living at the distance of the east and the west and the difference of hundred and thousand years; they reached to the same results with the help of this insight. But when the religions became distant from the original source some external opinions, strange doctrines and teachings made their way into them. And as these additions were not derived from the common source and insight but were the creations of human beings equipped with different nature, inclinations,

knowledge and rational levels, the buildings raised on these common foundations became quite different in their style, structure and look.

Thus, if any label of reality and truth that can be given, is only to those things which are common in all religions, not to the differing and detailed forms and structures of these religions. Truth is a comprehensive species having no individual differences. We cannot apply the word *Haq* on the differing statements that God is One, Gods are two and Gods are in crores just like that we use the single word colour for white, red and green.

The statement that the origin of all religions is one, and there is a truth revealed to different nations in different periods, has been given in the Quran in explicit words. It has been repeatedly said in this book that the messengers of God have come in every nation (*Al-Nahl*: 36). No nation has passed without a Warner (*Fatir*: 24). All these messengers and warners received the message of truth from the same source (*Aale Imran*: 184; *al-Hadeed*: 25). Their message was one, and it was, "Serve Allah and eschew Evil" (*Al-Nahl*: 36). All received the same revelation from Allah.

أَعْبُدُوا اللَّهَ وَاجْتَنِبُوا الطَّاغُوتَ

"Serve Allah, and eschew Evil" (*al-Nahl*; 36)

Same revelation came to all from God:

وَمَا أَرْسَلْنَا مِنْ قَبْلِكَ مِنْ رَسُولٍ إِلَّا نُوحِي إِلَيْهِ أَنَّهُ لَا إِلَهَ إِلَّا أَنَا فَاعْبُدُونِ

*Not a messenger did We send before thee without this inspiration sent by Us to him: that there is no god but I; therefore, worship and serve Me. (Al-Anbiya: 25)*

Nobody from among them said that whatever we are presenting is the outcome of our reason and thought. Instead all of them said that this is all from God

وَمَا كَانَ لَنَا أَنْ نَأْتِيَكُمْ بِسُلْطَانٍ إِلَّا بِإِذْنِ اللَّهِ وَعَلَى اللَّهِ  
فَلْيَتَوَكَّلِ الْمُؤْمِنُونَ ۝ وَمَا لَنَا أَنْ لَا نَتَوَكَّلَ عَلَى اللَّهِ وَقَدْ  
هَدَانَا سُبُلَنَا

*It is not for Us to bring an authority except as Allah permits. And on Allah let all men of faith put their trust. Why should we not trust Allah? Indeed He has guided us to the ways we follow. (Ibrahim: 11, 12)*

Moreover, none of them asked to perform their own worship. Everybody said to worship One Allah.

وَمَا كَانَ لِشَيْءٍ أَنْ يُؤْتِيَهُ اللَّهُ الْكِتَابَ وَالْحُكْمَ وَالنَّبُوءَ ثُمَّ  
يَقُولَ لِلنَّاسِ كُونُوا عِبَادًا لِي مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ وَلَكِنْ كُونُوا  
رَبَّانِيِّينَ ۝

*It is not (possible) that a man, in whom is given the Book, and wisdom and the prophetic office should say to people: "Be ye my worshippers rather than Allah's. On the contrary (he would say): "Be ye worshippers of Him (Who is truly the cherisher of all). (Aale Imran: 79)*

This is the common teaching that every religious guide provided to his nation.

The Quran says that in the beginning the people were one single *ummat* i.e. they were in pure natural condition and they had been provided with the knowledge of right path.<sup>1</sup> Then differences occurred among them because some of them tried to transgress from their right limits, to rise above their natural status and to obtain rights more than their natural rights. Then the messengers began to come from God to provide them true knowledge and

<sup>1</sup> This point should be kept in mind that against the modern theory of evolution and philosophy of history, the Quran says that the origin of human species on land did not occur in the darkness of ignorance but he was equipped with the light of knowledge from God. Allah made the first man i.e. Adam his messenger and provided to him through inspiration the knowledge which was necessary for his life on land.

establish social justice among them. This has been the mission of all messengers in the world. Those who accepted the mission followed their knowledge correctly and abided by their rule, only they are on the right way, other are on falsehood ----- all those who denied following the messengers and those who tailored their teachings according to their lust.

وَمَا كَانَ النَّاسُ إِلَّا أُمَّةً وَاحِدَةً فَاخْتَلَفُوا

*Mankind was but one nation, but differed later. (Yunus:19)*

كَانَ النَّاسُ أُمَّةً وَاحِدَةً فَبَعَثَ اللَّهُ النَّبِينَ مُبَشِّرِينَ وَ  
مُنذِرِينَ وَأَنْزَلَ مَعَهُمُ الْكِتَابَ بِالْحَقِّ لِيَحْكُمَ بَيْنَ النَّاسِ  
فِيمَا اخْتَلَفُوا فِيهِ وَمَا اخْتَلَفَ فِيهِ إِلَّا الَّذِينَ أُوتُوهُ مِنْ بَعْدِ  
مَا جَاءَتْهُمْ الْبَيِّنَاتُ بَغْيًا بَيْنَهُمْ فَهَدَى اللَّهُ الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا  
لِمَا اخْتَلَفُوا فِيهِ مِنَ الْحَقِّ بِإِذْنِهِ وَاللَّهُ يَهْدِي مَنْ يَشَاءُ إِلَى  
صِرَاطٍ مُسْتَقِيمٍ ۝

*Mankind was one single nation, and Allah sent Messengers with glad tidings and warnings; and with them He sent the Book in truth, to judge between people in matters wherein they differed; but the People of the Book, after the clear Signs came to them, did not differ among themselves, except through selfish contumacy. Allah by His Grace guided the believers to the Truth, concerning that wherein they differed. For Allah guided whom He will to a path that is straight. (Al- Baqarah: 213)*

لَقَدْ أَرْسَلْنَا رُسُلَنَا بِالْبَيِّنَاتِ وَأَنْزَلْنَا مَعَهُمُ الْكِتَابَ وَالْمِيزَانَ  
لِيَقُومَ النَّاسُ بِالْقِسْطِ وَأَنْزَلْنَا الْحَدِيدَ فِيهِ بَأْسٌ شَدِيدٌ وَ  
مَنْفَعٌ لِلنَّاسِ

*We sent aforetime our messengers with Clear Signs and sent down with them the Book and the Balance<sup>1</sup> (of Right*

<sup>1</sup> Balance (ميزان) means that perfectly balanced collective system which was sent in the form of *shari'ah* of Allah through the messengers so that justice may be maintained among people.

and Wrong), that men may stand forth in justice ;and We sent down Iron, in which is (material for) mighty war, as well as many benefits for mankind, that Allah may test who it is that will help, Unseen, Him and His messengers: For Allah is Full of Strength, Exalted in Might (and able to enforce His Will). (Al-Hadeed: 25)

فَمَنِ اتَّبَعَ هُدَايَ فَلَا يَضِلُّ وَلَا يَشْقَىٰ ۚ وَمَنْ أَعْرَضَ عَنِّي  
ذِكْرِي فَإِنَّ لَهُ مَعِيشَةً ضَنْكًا وَنَحْشُرُهُ يَوْمَ الْقِيَمَةِ أَعْمَىٰ

Whosoever follows My Guidance, will not lose his way, nor fall into misery. But whosoever turns away from My Message, verily for him is a life narrowed down, and We shall raise him up blind on the Day of Judgment."

(Taha: 123,124)

This is the view point of history or the moral interpretation of history as presented by the Quran which very satisfactorily solves not only the puzzle of cultural differences but also that of the religious differences. The Quran explicitly tells that the messengers of God came to all nations to bring them back to the natural way of life from which they repelled because of their rebellion, and to establish them on the way of truth and justice. And the same attitude of rebellion which was the real cause of their misguidance incessantly repelled and continually brought them to the same crooked ways. Thus, whatever little number of correct views and true moral principles are found in different nations are the remnants of the teachings of messengers which have penetrated to the minds of nations because of their own strength.

The claim of the Quran after this is that "Islam" to which it is inviting is the same "original religion" which all messengers have been presenting to all nations. Mohammad.(SAW) has not brought a unique religion not presented before.

قُلْ مَا كُنْتُ بِدْعًا مِنَ الرُّسُلِ

Say: *"I am not an innovation among the messengers*

*(Al-Ahqaf: 9)*

إِنَّا أَوْحَيْنَا إِلَيْكَ كَمَا أَوْحَيْنَا إِلَى نُوحٍ وَالنَّبِيِّينَ مِنْ بَعْدِهِ

*We have sent thee inspiration, as We sent it to Noah and the messengers after him*

*(Al-Nisa: 163)*

No land, Arab, Egypt, Persia, India, China, Japan, America, Europe or Africa was kept deprived of this message. Messengers of God have come to every place with His Book, and it is very possible that people like Buddha, Krishna, Rama, Confucius, Zoroaster, Mani, Socrates, Pythagoras etc. might have been from among these messengers. But the difference between Mohammad (SAW) and the other preachers is that their original message lost in the differences of people while the teachings of the last messenger are preserved in original form.

Thus the truth is that, Islam is not a religion among other religions, but it is the true and original religion of human beings, all other religions are the adulterated forms of the same. Whatever reality and truth is found in religions is the remnant of the same Islam which came to all and lost in differences. There is as much of Islam present in any religion as is the amount of the remnant truth in it. As for those differences which are against Islam, they are all false and calling them truth (*Haq*) is a manifest injustice. Instead of demonstrating this false liberalism we should say to all our human brothers, "Friends! Kindly give up this bigotry and narrow mindedness, and instead of sticking to the amalgam of truth and falsehood accept that truth which is pure and unpolluted. Truth is not an inherited property of any generation, nation or country; it is the common property of entire humanity. This property was distributed by the Master of the world to all countries, nations and



generations. It was our and your misfortune if others lost and polluted it with the poisons like worship of creatures, tyranny, injustice and unwanted distinctions. There is no sense that you keep attached to this misfortune willingly or unwillingly only because your great grand fathers committed this mistake. If Mohammad (SAW) received this inheritance and transmitted as such, no poison of creature's worship, tyrannical and unjust customs, and unwanted differences could be mixed in it then, it is a kind of good luck, ours yours and the good luck of whole mankind. Be thankful for it and do not hesitate to take benefits of it only because this blessing of God is being given to you though an Arab. Truth is one of the universal blessings like air, water and light. Moreover, if you do not close your nose to the air because it is coming from the east, you do not hesitate to swallow water only because it springs from a particular land, and you do not vacillate in making use of light only because it is spreading from the lamp of a particular person, then what is the cause that you hesitate accepting the reward of pure truth coming to you through Mohammad (SAW), the Arabian, only because one who presented it did not take birth in your land.

Tarjumanul Quran: Safar, 1353 A.H; June, 1934 C.E.

## True Meaning of Islamic Nationality

The word nation (قوم) has been current in present days for the party of Muslims and the same term is generally used to denote our collectivity. But it is a fact --- and in some groups unwanted benefit is drawn from the fact ----- that the word *Qawm* (or any other word giving the sense of nation) has not been used in the Quran and *hadith* as a term for Muslims. I want to tell in brief, what is the real evil in these words for which they are not preferred in Islam and what are those other words used in the Quran and *hadith*? This is not simply an academic discussion, but it brings into focus the mistake of many viewpoints because of which our attitude has become basically wrong.

The word *Qawm* (قوم) or its equivalent English word nation, both are in fact, the terms of the ignorant period. People of ignorance never established nationality on purely cultural basis; neither in the period of ancient ignorance, nor in modern period. Love of lineage and traditional relations had been so deeply imbibed in the threads of their hearts and brains that they could never free the concept of nationality from lineal relations and attachment with the historical traditions. As the ancient Arabs generally used the word *Qawm* (قوم) for race or tribe, today also the word nation necessarily connotes common descent. And, as this thing is against the Islamic conception of society, the Quran does not use the word *Qawm* (قوم) or its equivalents like (شعب) etc. as a term for the party of Muslims. Obviously, how it was possible to use a term for a party whose basis of collectivity had no connection to the blood, soil and colour or other such things; which had been constructed and raised purely on

the basis of principles and points of view; which began with migration (هجرة), cutting away from race and material relations?

The word that the Quran has used for Muslims is *hizb* (حزب), which means party. Nations rise on the basis of lineage and race while parties stand on the basis of rules and viewpoints. According to this, Muslims are in fact not a nation, they are a party instead. They have been distinguished from and joined together on the basis that they believe in and follow a law and way. Those who are common in this law and way belong to one group wherever they live and whatever nationality or race they may have. And those who do not belong to this law and way have no relation to this party even if they are having closest material relations to the members of the party. The Quran views only two parties in the entire population of the globe — the Party of Allah (حزب الله) and the Party of Satan (حزب الشيطان). The Quran considers whole party of Satan as one even if there are many basic and methodical differences, because their way of thinking and actions is not Islam in any way, and they have joined together in the following of Satan despite partial differences. The Quran says:

إِسْتَحْوَذَ عَلَيْهِمُ الشَّيْطَانُ فَأَنسَاهُمْ ذِكْرَ اللَّهِ أُولَٰئِكَ

حِزْبُ الشَّيْطَانِ ۚ إِلَّا إِنَّ حِزْبَ الشَّيْطَانِ هُمُ الْخَاسِرُونَ ۝

*"Satan has got the better of them; So he has made them forgot the remembrance of Allah. They are the party of Satan. Truly it is the party of Satan that will lose."*

(al-Mujadila: 19)

Contrast to it the members of Allah's party, even if they had been quite different in race, homeland, language and historical tradition, even if there had been bloodshed among their forefathers, when began cooperating in viewpoint and ways of life told by God, they in fact united

in relationships with God (حبلى الله). All their relations with the party of Satan cut off as soon as they joined this new party.

This difference of party breaks the relation between the son and the father, even that the son cannot heir the property left by the father. The words of *hadith* are لا يتوارث اهل الملتين (member of two different religions cannot heir each other).

This difference of party separates wife from the husband; their relations are banned as soon as the difference appears because the ways of both have become different. Both are banned to each other. The Quran says: "لاهن حل لهم ولاهم يحلون لهن" (they are neither allowed for unbelievers nor the unbelievers are allowed to them—*al-Mumtahina*: 10).

This difference of party puts a complete social ban between the member of a brotherhood and family, so that the marriage of a member of Allah's party with the member of Satan's party become unlawful even though both belong to the same racial brotherhood. The Quran says: "Do not marry unbelieving women until they believe: a slave woman who believes is better than an unbelieving woman, even though she allures you. Nor marry your girls to unbelievers until they believe: A man slave who believes is better than an unbeliever even though he allures you."

This difference of party does not simply cut the relations of race and birth place but establishes a tussle which continues so long as they do not accept the principles of the party of Allah. The Quran says:

قَدْ كَانَتْ لَكُمْ أُسْوَةٌ حَسَنَةٌ فِي إِبْرَاهِيمَ وَالَّذِينَ مَعَهُ إِذْ قَالُوا  
لِقَوْمِهِمْ إِنَّا بُرَاءُ مِنْكُمْ وَمِمَّا تَعْبُدُونَ مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ كَفَرْنَا  
بِكُمْ وَبَدَا بَيْنَنَا وَبَيْنَكُمْ الْعَدَاوَةُ وَالْبَغْضَاءُ أَبَدًا حَتَّى تُؤْمِنُوا  
بِاللَّهِ وَخُذُوا قَوْلَ إِبْرَاهِيمَ لِأَبِيهِ لَأَسْتَغْفِرَنَّ لَكَ

*There is for you an excellent example in Ibrahim and those with him, when they said to their people: "We are clear of you and of whatever ye worship besides Allah: we have rejected you and there has arisen between us and you, enmity and hatred for ever, unless you believe in Allah and Him alone": but not when Abraham said to his father: "I will pray for forgiveness for thee."*

(al-Mumtahina: 4)

وَمَا كَانَ اسْتِغْفَارُ إِبْرَاهِيمَ لِأَبِيهِ إِلَّا عَنْ مَوْعِدَةٍ وَعَدَهَا إِيَّاهُ  
قَلَّمَا تَبَيَّنَ لَهُ أَنَّهُ عَدُوٌّ لِلَّهِ تَبَرَّأَ مِنْهُ

*And Abraham prayed for his father's forgiveness only because of a promise he had made to him. But when it became clear to him that he was an enemy to Allah, he dissociated himself from him.*

(al-Tauba: 114)

This difference of party makes relation of love unlawful (*haram*) even between a family and closest of the kin. Even if the father, brother and son belong to the party of Satan, the member of the Party of Allah will revolt against and deceive his party, if he loves them. Words of the Quran are as follows:

لَا تَجِدُ قَوْمًا يُؤْمِنُونَ بِاللَّهِ وَالْيَوْمِ الْآخِرِ يُوَادُّونَ مَنْ حَادَّ  
اللَّهَ وَرَسُولَهُ وَلَوْ كَانُوا آبَاءَهُمْ أَوْ أَبْنَاءَهُمْ أَوْ إِخْوَانَهُمْ أَوْ  
عَشِيرَتَهُمْ

*You will not find any people who believe in Allah and the Last Day, loving those who oppose Allah and his messenger, even though they were their fathers or their sons, or their brother or their kindred. (al-Mujadala: 22)*

أُولَئِكَ حِزْبُ اللَّهِ أَلَا إِنَّ حِزْبَ اللَّهِ هُمُ الْمُفْلِحُونَ ○

*They are the party of Allah. Truly it is the party of Allah that will achieve success.* (al-Mujadala: 22)

Another word in terms of party as used by the Quran is *Ummat* (أمة). This word has been used frequently in the *hadith* also. The word *ummat* is used for that group of people who have come close to each other because of some matter of common interest (أمر جامع). A group which has certain matter common is accordingly called the *ummat*. For example the people of the same period are called the *ummat*. People of a race or a country are also called *ummat*. Muslims have been called an *ummat* not for any race, homeland or economy but for the mission of their life, basic principle and the way of their party. Thus the Quran says:

كُنْتُمْ خَيْرَ أُمَّةٍ أُخْرِجَتْ لِلنَّاسِ تَأْمُرُونَ بِالْمَعْرُوفِ وَ  
تَنْهَوْنَ عَنِ الْمُنْكَرِ وَتُؤْمِنُونَ بِاللَّهِ

*You are the best of people, evolved for the mankind. Enjoining what is right, forbidding what is wrong, and believing in Allah.* (Aal-e-Imran: 110)

وَكَذَلِكَ جَعَلْنَاكُمْ أُمَّةً وَسَطًا لِتَكُونُوا شُهَدَاءَ عَلَى  
النَّاسِ وَيَكُونَ الرُّسُولُ عَلَيْكُمْ شَهِيدًا ۝

*Thus have we made of you an Ummah, justly balanced.<sup>1</sup> That you might be witness<sup>2</sup> over the mankind, and the messenger a witness over yourselves.* (Al-Baqara: 143)

Think over these *ayaat*. *Ummat-e Wasat* (أمة وسطا) which we have translated as 'Ummah justly balanced' means Muslims are an international party. These people have been selected out of all nations of the world who are ready to accept a particular principle, to bring into action a meticulous programme and accomplish a scrupulous mission. As they have come out of all nations and have

<sup>1</sup> The *Wasat* (وسط) means middle one and it connotes higher also.

<sup>2</sup> *Shaheed* (شاهد) means witness as well as one who looks after

disconnected from each nation after becoming a party, they are the party justly balanced (أمة وسطا). But after breaking away from each party, they have developed a new relationship with all nations. Their role is the role of a Devine Magistrate. The words 'You are to look after the mankind' clearly indicate that Muslims have been appointed in the world as magistrates by Allah. And the phrase 'for mankind' clearly indicates that the mission of a Muslim is universal. The mission, in brief, is to establish the system of thought and action revealed to the leader of Allah's party, *Sayyidina* Mohammad (SAW), by making use of all mental, moral and material powers and win over each system. This is the basis on which Muslims have been made an *ummat* (أمت).

The third word frequently used by the prophet (SAW) as a term to express the collectivity of Muslims is '*Jama'at*' (جماعت) and this also means party like the word *hizb* (حزب). When we think on *hadiths* like 'It is mandatory upon you to keep in *Jama'at* and 'there is Allah's hand on the *jama'at*' and many such sayings of the prophet we come to the point that the prophet (SAW) advertently refrained from using words like *Qawm* (قوم) or *Sha'b* (شعب) or their synonyms and particularly used the term *Jama'ah*. He never said, 'be always with the *qawm*' or 'there is the hand of Allah on the *qawm*'. He always used the word *Jama'at* on such occasions. The only cause of this is --- and can only be ---- that for expressing the collectivity of Muslims the words *jama'at*, *hizb* and party suit more than the *qawm*. The sense, in which the word *qawm* is often used, can be applied to a person who may follow any way or principle but he should be connected to a group by birth, name, way of life, and social contacts. In contrast to it the party, *jama'at* and *hizb* are the words which connote a collectivity based on principles and way

of life and the entry to and exit from the collectivity depends upon principles and ways. After you have parted away from the principles and way of a party you can no more be a member of it; neither you can use its name nor represent it, nor appear as the protector of its benefits, nor, there can be any sort of support from your side for its causes. If you say that I do not support the principles and purposes of the party but my parents had been the members of the party, my name is like the names of its members, therefore, I should avail the rights of a member of the party, your argument would be as ridiculous as to compel the listeners to doubt your mental state. Now change the concept of a party by the concept of *qawm* and then you will find way to do all such kind of things.

Islam commanded to marry between only Muslims to keep unity in the members of the international party and harmony in their social life. Simultaneously, such educational and training programme was suggested to their children that they may rise as the followers of the principles and ways of the party and the power of the party may strengthen through preaching as well as by procreation. It is this point from where the party begins to be a nation (قوم). Afterwards the common social life, racial relations and historical traditions made this nationality stronger.

To this extent it was correct, but slowly Muslims forgot that they are in fact a party and their nationality is truly based on being a party. This forgetfulness has now grown and reached to the extent that the concept of party has completely vanished in the concept of nationality. Muslims have now stunted to the level of a nation like German, Japanese or English nations. They have forgotten that reality is that principle and way on which Islam made them an *ummat*, that mission for which it organized its



members into a party. Unmindful of this reality, they borrowed from non Muslims the ignorant concept of nationality. This is such a fundamental mistake that its ill effects have so comprehensively spread that nobody can take steps for the revival of Islam so long as this mistake is not corrected.

Whatever love, friendship and cooperation exist between the members of a party is not personal and familial, but it is on the basis that they are the believers of the same principle and the followers of the same way. If a member of the party works against the principle or the way of the party, then not only that the other members of the party are not to cooperate with him but, in contrast, it is their duty to stop him from this rebellious tilt, take hard action according to the rules and finally expel him from the party. Such examples in the world are not unavailable that if any person rebels against the way of the party is killed.<sup>1</sup> But look at the situation of Muslims. What type of mistake they have become prey of, only because of considering themselves as a nation? Whenever a person of them works against Islamic principles for his benefit he expects cooperation and help from the fellow Muslims. If he does not get any help he complains, "Look a *Musalman* does not help the other *Musalman*". Recommenders recommend for him in these words: "A Muslim brother will benefit, help him". Helpers also call their helping hand as Islamic sympathy. In the entire matter there are words like Islamic sympathy, Islamic brotherhood, Religious Islamic relations etc. even though, in fact, referring to Islam for acting against Islam is absurd. If Islam which they name is truly alive in them and they come to know that a member of Islamic Party is doing

---

<sup>1</sup> Basis of killing the apostate in Islam is the same. Russian socialists also punish their apostates by killing

anything against Islam, they just stand to combat him and leave him only after repentance. Leave aside helping or recommending anyone, a man in a living Islamic society cannot even speak a single word to go against Islamic principles. But it is happening day and night in your society, the cause of which is nothing but that the ignorant nationality has crept into you; the thing that you are calling Islamic brotherhood is in fact the relationship of ignorant nationality that you have borrowed from non Muslims.

The miracle of this ignorance is that a strange concept of "national benefit" has developed in you which you often call as "Islamic benefit" without hesitation. What is this so called Islamic or national benefit? That is the welfare of those who are called Muslims i.e. they could earn wealth, gain more respect and get power, their world may be strong any way, no matter this is received through the obedience of Islamic viewpoint and principle or through its disobedience. You call those as Muslims who are Muslims by birth or family even if you do not find any quality of Islam in their opinions or actions despite thorough search. As if in your view *Musalman* is not the name of spirit, it is simply a body, and a man devoid of the quality of Islam can also be called a Muslim. You call the governments Islamic as those run by these bodies because you have given these bodies the name of Muslims according to your framed concept. You call their development as the development of Islam, their benefit as the benefit of Islam, even if this government, development and benefit is completely against Islam. Like *Juniat* (جونيت) is not a principle, it is a nationality, and like a German nationalist wants the empowerment of a German in any way, you also have made Muslim Being (مسلمانييت) only a nationality. And your Muslim nationalists

want to empower their nation even if this empowerment is principally and in action through adopting methods against Islam. Is it not ignorance? Have you not, in fact, forgotten the fact that the Muslim was the name of that international party which stood in the world with a particular viewpoint and a practical programme for the growth and development of humanity? How you can call Islamic the works of those who after avoiding this viewpoint and programme work according to some other programme in their personal or collective capacity? Have you ever heard the name socialist given to a person working on the principles of capitalism? Do you ever call a capitalist government as socialist? Do you call Fascist institutions as democratic? Perhaps you will not hesitate a little in calling a person ignorant and foolish who uses these terms out of place. But here we observe that the term Islam and *Musalman* are being used completely out of context and yet nobody is smelling ignorance.

The word *Musalman* itself indicates that this word cannot be a personal noun, but it is an adjective, and there can be no meaning of it other than the "Follower of Islam". It indicates the particular mental, moral and practical attribute of a man that is named as "Islam". Thus you cannot use this word for a Muslim in the same manner as for Indian, Japanese or Chinese. As soon as a man having the name like a Muslim repels from the principle of Islam, his status as a Muslim remains no more. Now, whatever he does is in his personal capacity; he has no right to use the name Islam. Similarly you can use words like "Muslim benefit", "Muslim growth", "Muslim government or state", "Muslim ministry", "Muslim organization" only in those situations which are just according to the Islamic viewpoint and principle, and work for the mission Islam has brought. In other situations

it is not right to use the word Muslim for anything; you can give any name to them but never the name Muslim, because a Muslim is nothing without the attribute of Islam. You cannot think that any man or nation distracted from socialism could be named socialist or any benefit in this sense could be the benefit of socialism, any government the government of socialists, organization the organization of socialists, or any growth the growth of socialists. Then why in the case of a Muslim you think that it is the personal name of a man or a nation even without Islam, and his everything could be called Islamic.

This fundamental mistake has made wrong your bent of mind about your culture, civilization and history. You call those kingdoms and governments Islamic which were established on non Islamic principles only because they were ruled by Muslims. You call the civilization developed in comfortable courts of Cordova, Baghdad, Delhi and Cairo as Islamic though it had nothing to do with Islam. When you are asked about Islamic culture you at once point out the *Taj Mahal* of Agra as if it is the most prominent sample of this culture. Though it is not at all the Islamic culture to acquire a large portion of land and erect a building worth millions of money to bury a person. When you tell about the prides of Islamic history, you narrate the achievements of Abbasids, Saljuqs and Mughals even though from the point of view of real Islamic history a large part of these achievements should be written not in golden words but by black ink as a list of crimes. You call the history of Muslim kings as "Islamic History" and you also call it the "History of Islam" as if the name of these kings is Islam. Instead of evaluating your history in the light of Islamic mission, principles and theories, seeing and showing with justice the Islamic activities as distinguished from non Islamic activities, you

consider favouring and defending the Muslim rulers as the service of Islamic history. This bent in your mind developed only because you consider everything of a Muslim as "Islamic" and your opinion is that a non Islamic act of a man called a Muslim can also be called the act of a "Muslim".

You have adopted the same crooked viewpoint in your *milli* politics also. You remember a nation distracted from Islamic principles, theories and mission by the word "Muslim Nation", and to represent this nation, or by its name or for this nation, everybody or group can do activities of their likeliness. In your view every person belonging to the "Muslim Nation" can represent Muslims and lead them even if that poor person knows nothing about Islam. You are ready and eager to follow each of the party you consider beneficial in any way, no matter if its mission is quite different from the mission of Islam. You become glad if Muslims get four pieces of bread even if these are prohibited (حرام) in view of Islam. You rejoice triumphantly seeing a Muslim on any chair, no matter if he uses this power for non Islamic purposes as a non Muslim could have done. Often you name Islamic benefit the thing which are truly non Islamic, invest your power and energy in supporting and protecting institutions established totally against the principles of Islam and waste money and national power for those purposes which are never Islamic. All these are the consequences of the fundamental mistake that you consider yourself a nation. You have forgotten the truth that you are in fact an "international party" whose benefit and objective is none other than establishing the principles of the party as rulers in the world. So long as you do not develop and make this view live, your behaviour in any matter of life will not be correct.

**Tarjumanul Quran: Safar, 1358 A.H.; April, 1939 C.E**

## More about Islamic Nationality

After the publication of this paper, some of our friends expressed doubt that naming "*Islamii Jama'at*" as a "party" instead of "nation" (قوم) gives way to the thought that it may live as a part of the nationality of a country as there are many political parties in a nation and despite having their own viewpoint are included in the larger collectivity (قوم). If Muslims are a party of the same type, they also can live as a part of the nation of their country.

The above mentioned misunderstanding arose because people generally take the word *jama'at* or party in the sense of a political party. But these are not the original meaning of the word; they have become popular only because of the use of the word in a particular sense. Its original meaning is that the people who have become close together because of a particular faith, viewpoint, way and objective are a *jama'at*. The Quran has used the words "*hizb*" (حزب) and "*ummat*" (امت) in the same sense, and the word *Jama'at* (جماعت) has been used in the same sense in the sayings of the prophet (SAW) and his companions. Same is the meaning of the "party".

Now there is a party which has a particular viewpoint and programme of political operations in view of the special conditions of a nation or country. This type of party is simply a political party. So it can work --- and works --- as a part of the nation she happens to exist in.

The other party is that which stands with holistic viewpoint and a universal world-view, who keeps in view the entire humanity (without distinction of nation and country) and universal outlook, which likes to structure

and mold life according to a new pattern, whose viewpoint and outlook wants to mold the doctrines and opinions, principles and morals, individual behaviour, collective system with all its details according to its own mould and has the intention of bringing about a permanent culture and a special civilization. This party is also a party in true sense but it cannot be a party to work as a part of the nation. This is above the limited boundaries of the nation. Its mission is to break all the racial and traditional biases based on which are the nations of the world. How then it can associate herself to these nationalities. It establishes a rational nationality instead of the racial and historical nationalities. It makes an expanding nationality instead of the static one. It becomes a nationality that is ready to take entire population of the globe into its fold on the basis of rational, cultural and genuine unity. And yet, despite becoming a nation it remains a party because the basis of entry into it is not the birth but it is the following of the viewpoint and the way on the basis of which it has come into existence.

In fact, *Musalman* is the name of this second type of the party. It is not that type of party which comes into existence in a nation. But it is a party which rises to make a permanent system of culture and civilization and intends to make a big universal nationality based upon reason after dissolving the boundaries between the smaller parties. It will be surely correct to call it a nation because it is not ready to become one culturally or sentimentally with any of the racial or historical nationalities of the world but erects its own structure of culture and civilization according to its own viewpoint of life and social philosophy. But despite being a nation in this sense, in fact it remains a party because mere accident of birth does not make any person its member as long as he is not

faithful to and follower of its way. Similarly, the mere accident of birth in any nation does not stop him entry to it after quitting his nation if he is ready to believe in its way. Thus whatever I have said actually means that the nationality of a Muslim nation stands on the basis of its being a party. Its status as a nation is that of a branch of its being a party. It will be considered degeneration if it remains a mere nation as separated from the status of a party.

Fact is that the status of Islamic party in the history of Islamic collectivities has been unique. Buddhism and Christianity addressed the humanity at large and also tried to make universal brotherhood on the basis of a viewpoint and way but both of them were not having a collective philosophy except few moral principles so that they could erect a holistic system of culture and civilization. Thus they could not make a universal nationality and succeeded in making only a kind of brotherhood. Later on the scientific culture of the West stood up which tried to address the world nations, but the ghost of nationalism overwhelmed it from the very first day, and thus it also failed in making a universal nationality. Now, socialism has come up which is trying to bring about a culture by dissolving the boundaries of nations and based upon a universal viewpoint. But since now, as the new culture present in her mind has not yet come into existence in complete form, the Marxism has not yet become a universal nationality.<sup>1</sup> Till now, Islam alone is such a viewpoint and way which makes universal nationality based on culture after dissolving historical nationalities.

---

<sup>1</sup> But now, Marxism itself has been infected by nationalism. The sentiments of Russian nationalism are becoming more prominent in Stalin and his party. The word "fatherland" is often found in Russian socialist literature, even in the Russian constitution of 1936. In contrast, look at Islam which always uses "*Darul Islam*" instead of the father or mother land.



Thus those who are not well aware of the spirit of Islam feel difficult to understand how one single collectivity can be at once and simultaneously a nation and a party. In none of the nations they have come across, the members take not birth, but get entry. They observe that a man born Italian is the member of Italian nation and a person not born Italian can never become an Italian. They do not know about any nation in which a person becomes a member on the basis of belief and way; as soon as the belief and the way changes he is considered an outsider. For them it is not the property of a nation, it can only be the property of a party. But when they observe that this unique party makes its own and distinct culture, stresses upon being a nationality and does not become ready to join the local nationalities anywhere, the matter for them becomes a big riddle.

Same misunderstanding, the Muslims are abound like the non Muslims. The ignorant concept of "historical nationality" has flourished among them because of continuous extra Islamic teachings, training and living in that environment. They have forgotten the fact that their original position was that of a party which was brought to existence to bring about a universal revolution in the world, whose purpose was to expand its viewpoint over the world, whose duty was to create a universal social system on the basis of its social philosophy after dislodging all the wrong systems of the world. Forgotten all this, they have considered themselves simply a nation like all other nations of the world. Now in their gatherings and societies, conferences and collectivities or in their newspapers and journals there is found no discussion on the mission of social life for which they were invited from the nations of the world and made into a distinct "*ummat*". Instead of this mission the "benefit of

Muslims” has become the focus of all attention. *Musalman* means all those people who have taken birth in a Muslim family, and benefit means the material, political benefit of those racial Muslims or at the most the protection of that culture which they have inherited from their grandfathers. They run after any activity they consider effective to protect and develop this cause like Mussolini who readily used every way he considered beneficial for Italians. He was not bound to any principle or method, nor are they. He said whatever is beneficial to Italians is right; they say whatever is beneficial for Muslims is right. This is what I call as the downfall of Muslims. And for raising my voice against this downfall I felt the necessity of recalling that you are not a nation like racial and historical nations, but in true sense you are a party and your salvation is only in that you develop party sense among yourselves.

There are so many bad consequences of this lack of party sense and self forgetfulness that they could be counted only with difficulty. This is the consequence of the same senselessness and forgetfulness that a Muslim today is ever ready to follow everyone and obey each viewpoint and way no matter if it is repelled to any extent from the viewpoint of Islam. He becomes a nationalist, also communist and does not even hesitate to accept fascist principles. You will find among Muslims the follower of nearly all sociological and metaphysical opinions and scientific theories (علمي افكار). There is no political, social and civilization movement in the world which has no Muslim members in it. Fine thing is that all of them call and think themselves and are understood by others to be Muslims. All these stray people do not remember that *Musalman* is not the name because of birth, but it is an adjective for one who follows Islam.

Calling one who walks on ways other than Islam is a completely wrong use of this word. Muslim nationalist and Muslim communist are self contradicting terms like “communist capitalist” and “Jain butcher”.

## **Enjoining the Right and Forbidding the Wrong**

Everything has two levels of perfection in its attributes. One level is that the attribute reaches its culmination point. The other level is that the attribute is so strong as to transmit it to others and colour them in the same colour. First level of perfection in ice is that it is cold to highest degree. Its second level of perfection is that it cools other things too. First level of perfection in fire is that it is very hot; the other level is that it heats the surroundings also. Similar is the situation in the case of virtues and vices. First perfection of a pious person is that he becomes personally pious to the highest degree; his other perfection is that he makes others also pious by his influence. Similarly the first perfection of a bad man is that he is equipped with evil to highest degree. The other perfection is that he transmits this attribute to others.

According to this general principle there are two degrees of perfection for a believer and a non believer. If a non Muslim is individually strong in his unbelief, he is on the first degree of perfection. And if he preaches unbelief, tries to stop people from the right path, pulls them away from it, propagates unbelief through his eloquence, wealth, sword or any other power, he obtains the second degree also. No other way to perfection remains for him after these two types of attainments. Similarly if a believer is personally strong in his faith and perfect in following the commands, he will be on the first degree of perfection. He will obtain the second degree of perfection when his faith becomes so strong that he begins to propagate truth, develops faith in others by his tongue

and pen, character and behaviour. Then he will have the right to be called a complete believer (مومن).

This subject has been discussed beautifully in 10<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> sections of *Surah Aal-e-Imran*. First of all it is said:

قُلْ يَا أَهْلَ الْكِتَابِ لِمَ تَكْفُرُونَ بِآيَاتِ اللَّهِ

Say: "O people of the book! Why reject ye the signs of Allah  
(Aale Imran: 98)

Then it is said:

قُلْ يَا أَهْلَ الْكِتَابِ لِمَ تَصُدُّونَ عَن سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ مَنَ آمَنَ  
تَعُودُنَهَا عِوَجًا

Say: O ye the people of the book! Why obstruct ye those who believe, from the path of Allah (Aal-e-Imran: 99)

Both of these verses clearly indicate that the first stage of perfection of unbelief is to reject God's words in ones own capacity. The second stage of perfection is to propagate it and stop people from the right way and to present them wrong ways of belief and action.

Afterwards, the addressees are the believers and to them also two things have been conveyed:

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا اتَّقُوا اللَّهَ حَقَّ تَقَاتِهِ وَلَا تَمُوتُنَّ إِلَّا وَأَنتُمْ  
مُسْلِمُونَ ○ وَاعْتَصِمُوا بِحَبْلِ اللَّهِ جَمِيعًا وَلَا تَفَرَّقُوا

O ye who believe! Fear Allah as He should be feared and die not except in a state of Islam. And hold fast all together the rope of Allah and be not divided among yourself  
(Aale-Imran: 102, 103)

Again:

وَلَتَكُنْ مِنْكُمْ أُمَّةٌ يَدْعُونَ إِلَى الْخَيْرِ وَيَأْمُرُونَ بِالْمَعْرُوفِ  
وَيَنْهَوْنَ عَنِ الْمُنْكَرِ وَأُولَئِكَ هُمُ الْمُفْلِحُونَ

Let there arise out of you a group of people inviting to all that is good, enjoining the right and forbidding the wrong  
(Aale-Imran: 104)

There has been a difference of opinion among the interpretation of the ayah: Let there arise a group of people (ولتكن منكم امة); the focus has been the word "out of you (منكم)". A group says: here the word منكم is not for exception but it is for description. The other group claims: "No, it is for exception".

The first group argues that Allah has made compulsory for every Muslim to enjoin the right and forbid the wrong as it is there in the Quran:

كُنْتُمْ خَيْرَ أُمَّةٍ أُخْرِجَتْ لِلنَّاسِ..... الخ

In fact enjoining the right and forbidding the wrong is compulsory for every capable person, either with hand, in words or at least by heart. Therefore, the meaning of the ayah is: "you become such a group who invites good and forbids the bad" because here the word من is for description and its example is as follows.

فَاجْتَنِبُوا الرِّجْسَ مِنَ الْأَوْثَانِ

*"(Therefore, shun from the filth of idols), not that you restrain from the filth from among the idols)".*

The other group says that the word من is here for exception and there are two causes for it. One is that, among Muslims there is a large number of people like women, children, aged persons and sick people who cannot fulfill the necessities of invitation to good and forbidding the bad. Moreover, there are certain conditions for enjoining the good and forbidding the wrong, which are not found in all people. It requires correct knowledge of good and renowned things. It requires reason and wisdom. It also requires that a man should be high leveled pious to invite for piety.

But this difference can be removed easily by thinking upon Allah's book and the *sunnah* of the prophet (SAW).

We have proven two perfections for a believer in the light of the holy words of Allah. First of them i.e. Allah's fear, obedience and holding the cord of Allah firmly, is necessary for the establishment of faith in the person. Therefore, presence of any level of this perfection is obviously necessary so that in its absence he will not be considered a believer. This is just like a lamp without light cannot be considered a lamp. Ice will not be ice if it is not cool. Fire without heat cannot be a fire. That is why Allah Ta'ala has firmly addressed all believers as follows:

اتَّقُوا اللَّهَ حَقَّ تَقَاتِهِ اور وَلَا تَمُوتُنَّ إِلَّا وَأَنْتُمْ مُسْلِمُونَ

*O ye who believe! Fear Allah as He should be feared, and die not except in a state of Islam (Aale Imran: 102)*  
..... and

وَاعْتَصِمُوا بِحَبْلِ اللَّهِ جَمِيعًا وَلَا تَفَرَّقُوا

*And hold fast all together the rope of Allah, and be not divided (Aale Imran: 103)*

There is no indication of any exception in this Ayah but in contrast there is emphasis together with generality, which connotes that each Muslim should compulsorily develop these qualities.

As far as the second degree of perfection is concerned, that is an extra excellence which is not necessary for one to be a believer, it is for being a perfect, excellent, dignified and magnificent believer. Now from the point of view of this perfection, a nation may have only two positions. One is that at least one part of it is equipped with the second degree perfection while other people qualify themselves according to the first degree. Allah Ta'ala says: if you are in this state i.e. if entire nation becomes the sun of guidance, enjoining the virtues and forbidding the vices for all nations, then you are the best *Ummah*:

كُنتُمْ خَيْرَ أُمَّةٍ أُخْرِجَتْ لِلنَّاسِ تَأْمُرُونَ بِالْمَعْرُوفِ وَ  
تَنْهَوْنَ عَنِ الْمُنْكَرِ وَتُؤْمِنُونَ بِاللَّهِ

*Ye are the best of people, evolved for mankind, enjoining what is right, forbidding what is wrong, and believing in Allah.* (Aale Imran: 110)

But if you are not equipped with this high ranked courage and the entire nation is not qualified with this attribute, then at least there should be a group among you inviting to the virtue and forbidding the vice.

وَلْيَكُنْ مِنْكُمْ أُمَّةٌ يَدْعُونَ إِلَى الْخَيْرِ

*There must be some people among you inviting to virtues*

That is why there is generality in the first *ayah* but no emphasis and in the second *ayah* there emphasis but no generality. These two levels of perfection of belief under discussion are two in theory. However, they are one in fact. Anybody who has strong belief in heart and fears Allah as He deserves, cannot keep patience in inviting to the right path whenever he sees anybody involved in misguidance and in undoing the evil wherever he looks it. Nature of a believer is like musk; the fragrance of belief does not remain confined to his body but emits and goes to whatever extent it may travel. Or his example is like a lamp, as soon as it is set ablaze with the brightness of belief it extends beams in the surroundings. As long as there is fragrance in the Musk, it will continue to provide aroma to the depths of soul. The lamp will continue illumination so long as it glows. But if the aroma of musk is not felt by the closet person and the light of the lamp does not illuminate its surrounding, everybody will say that musk is no more musk and the lamp has lost the character of a lamp. Same applies to a believer, if he does not invite to virtues, enjoins not good, tolerates vice and forbids it not, then it is a sign that the fire of God's fear has cooled down in him and the light of belief has blurred.



Therefore, the prophet (SAW) says: "whoever of you sees vice should stop and change it with his hand, if he has no power of it by tongue, if no power to this also, then at least he should consider it bad in heart and wish to finish it because it is the lowest degree of belief." "A heart having no hate for vice has no belief equal to a grain." This is because that according to the Quran one of the qualities of believers is to enjoin right and forbid the wrong.

وَالْمُؤْمِنُونَ وَالْمُؤْمِنَاتُ بَعْضُهُمْ أَوْلِيَاءُ بَعْضٍ يَأْمُرُونَ  
بِالْمَعْرُوفِ وَيَنْهَوْنَ عَنِ الْمُنْكَرِ

*The believers, men and women are protectors one of another, they enjoin what is just and forbid what is evil*

(Al-Tauba: 71)

الَّذِينَ اتَّخَذُوا الْعِبَادَةَ السَّائِدُونَ السَّائِحُونَ الرَّاكِعُونَ  
السَّاجِدُونَ الْأَمْرُونَ بِالْمَعْرُوفِ وَالنَّاهُونَ عَنِ الْمُنْكَرِ  
وَالْحَافِظُونَ لِحُدُودِ اللَّهِ

*Those that turn (to Allah) in repentance ; that serve Him, and praise Him; that wander in devotion to cause of Allah; that bow down and prostrate themselves in prayer; that enjoin good and forbid evil; and observe the limits set by Allah*

(Al-Tauba: 112)

الَّذِينَ إِنْ مَكَّنَّاهُمْ فِي الْأَرْضِ أَقَامُوا الصَّلَاةَ وَآتَوُا الزَّكَاةَ  
وَأَمَرُوا بِالْمَعْرُوفِ وَنَهَوْا عَنِ الْمُنْكَرِ

*(They are) those who, if We establish them in the land, establish regular prayer and give zakat, enjoin the right and forbid wrong: with Allah rests the end of affairs.*

(Al-Hajj: 41)

Then, if one of the necessary qualities of a believer is enjoining good and forbidding evil, why this quality has been graded as a collective duty (فرض كفاية) and why this leniency that it was considered enough if a group of Muslims performed the duty? Answer is that Allah, The Knower and Keeper of all information, knew that the

belief of Muslims will go on weakening after the period of His prophet, the nation (قوم) will turn towards downfall. So much so that a time will come that there will be billions of Muslims in the world but their belief will have no illumination even to enlighten their nearest whereabouts. In contrast, there will a threat to their own light of belief because of the overwhelming darkness of unbelief. Thus for these condition it was said at least a group among you should stand to enjoin good and fight the evil, because without it you cannot be saved from the punishment of your Lord. This subject has been fully discussed in the Quran:

لَعْنُ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا مِنْ بَنِي إِسْرَآئِيلَ عَلَى لِسَانِ دَاوُدَ  
وَعِيسَى ابْنِ مَرْيَمَ ذَلِكَ بِمَا عَصَوْا وَكَانُوا يَعْتَدُونَ ○  
كَانُوا لَا يَتَنَاهَوْنَ عَنْ مُنْكَرٍ فَعَلُوهُ لَبِئْسَ مَا كَانُوا يَفْعَلُونَ ○

*Curses were announced on those among the children of Israel who rejected faith, by the tongue of David and of Jesus, the son of Mary: because they disobeyed and persisted in excess. Nor did they forbid one another the inequities which they committed: evil were indeed the deeds which they did.* (Al-maida: 78,79)

فَلَوْلَا كَانَ مِنَ الْقُرُونِ مِنْ قَبْلِكُمْ أُولُوا بَقِيَّةٍ يَنْهَوْنَ عَنِ  
الْفَسَادِ فِي الْأَرْضِ إِلَّا قَلِيلًا مِمَّنْ أَنْجَيْنَا مِنْهُمْ وَاتَّبَعَ الَّذِينَ  
ظَلَمُوا مَا أَتَرَفُوا فِيهِ وَكَانُوا مُجْرِمِينَ ○ وَمَا كَانَ رَبُّكَ  
لِيُهْلِكَ الْقُرَىٰ بِظُلْمٍ وَأَهْلُهَا مُصْلِحُونَ ○

*If only there had been of the generation before you, the men of righteousness who prohibited men from mischief in the earth (but there were none) except a few among them whom we saved (from harm)? But the wrong doers pursued the enjoiment of the good things of life which were given them, and persisted in sin.*

*Nor would their Lord be the One to destroy the towns unjustly while their people are righteous.* (Hood:116,117)

The respected prophet (SAW) speaks on this topic as follows:

إِنَّ اللَّهَ لَا يُعَذِّبُ الْعَامَّةَ بِعَمَلٍ خَاصَّةٍ حَتَّى يَرَوْا الْمُنْكَرَ  
بَيْنَ ظَهْرَانِهِمْ وَهُمْ قَادِرُونَ عَلَى أَنْ يُنْكِرُوهُ فَلَا يُنْكِرُوهُ  
فَإِذَا فَعَلُوا ذَلِكَ عَذَّبَ اللَّهُ الْخَاصَّةَ وَالْعَامَّةَ

*Allah does not punish common people for the sins of special persons so long as a situation reaches that they look sins committed before them and do not stop even having power to do that. When they do it, Allah punishes all special and common people. (Narrated by Ahmad)*

وَالَّذِي نَفْسِي بِيَدِهِ لَتَأْمُرُنَّ بِالْمَعْرُوفِ وَلَتَنْهَوْنَ عَنِ  
الْمُنْكَرِ وَلَتَأْخُذُنَّ عَلَى يَدِ الْمُسِيءِ وَلَتَأْطِرْنَهُ عَلَى الْحَقِّ  
إِطْرَاءً أَوْ لَيَضْرِبَنَّ اللَّهُ قُلُوبَ بَعْضِكُمْ عَلَى بَعْضٍ أَوْ  
لَيُلْعَنَكُمْ كَمَا لَعَنَهُمْ.

*I swear by the one in Whose Hand is my soul it is mandatory upon you to enjoin good, forbid evil, hold the evil doer, and turn him to the right. Otherwise Allah Ta'ala will befall the evils of your hearts upon each other or He will curse you the way He cursed Bani Israel.*

*(Narrated by al-Tirmizi, abu Dawud, Ibn Majah with little difference in the text)*

Now it has become clear that the exception found in the Ayah (ولتكن منكم امة... الخ) does not mean that only a group from among Muslims is required to enjoin good and forbid evil, this service is not compulsory for others. But it means that at least one group should always be there to keep the lamp of virtues enlightened and remove the darkness of evil. If even one such group does not remain among them, then their being the best *ummat* is a farfetched idea, this nation (قوم) will not be saved from the punishment of Allah.

**Tarjumanul Quran, Jamadi al-'Ula 1352 AH; September 1933 CE**

## God's Law of Punishment

The Quran variously discusses about those nations which were inflicted with punishment by God in the past. The mode of punishment to each of them has been different. The punishment of Aad was different from that of the Thamud. On Madain it was distinct and on Pharaoh and his nation it was unique. However different the shape and mode of punishment might have been, the law of punishment is one and never changeable.

سُنَّةَ اللَّهِ فِي الَّذِينَ خَلَوْا مِنْ قَبْلُ وَلَنْ تَجِدَ لِسُنَّةِ اللَّهِ تَبْدِيلًا

*Such was the practice of Allah among those who lived aforetime: no change will thou find in the practice of Allah*  
(Al-Ahzab: 62)

All the sections of this law have been discussed in the Quran in full details. First of these sections is:

When the prosperity of a nation goes high, it inclines towards wrong and misguided activities and its dynamism as such turns from virtues towards vices.

وَإِذَا أَرَدْنَا أَنْ نُهْلِكَ قَرْيَةً أَمَرْنَا مُتْرَفِيهَا فَفَسَقُوا فِيهَا فَحَقَّ عَلَيْهَا الْقَوْلُ فَدَمَّرْنَاهَا تَدْمِيرًا

*When We decide to destroy a town, We command<sup>1</sup> those among them who are given the good things of this life (to be obedient) but they continue to transgress: so that the word is proved true against them: then We destroy them utterly*  
(Bani Israel: 16)

Second general principle is that Allah does not do injustice with nations but the sinner nations do injustice with themselves. God does not snatch away the reward

<sup>1</sup> Here command means natural command. The Quran calls every section of the law of nature as command (*Hukm, Izn* of God). You will find its details in our "*Risala Jabr-o-Qadr*"

which He gives to a nation; the unjust nation herself destroys it.

ذَٰلِكَ بِأَنَّ اللَّهَ لَمْ يَكُ مُغَيِّرًا نِّعْمَةً أَنْعَمَهَا عَلَىٰ قَوْمٍ حَتَّىٰ  
يُغَيِّرُوا مَا بِأَنْفُسِهِمْ

*"Because Allah will never change the grace which He has bestowed on a people until they change what is in their own) souls (Al-Anfal: 53)*

فَمَا كَانَ اللَّهُ يَظْلِمُهُمْ وَلَكِنْ كَانُوا أَنْفُسَهُمْ يَظْلِمُونَ

*It is not Allah Who wrongs them, but they wrong their own souls (Al-Tauba: 70)*

Third section of the law of punishment is that Allah Ta'ala does not punish a nation on her tyranny on herself in a hurry, but gives time and goes on warning her so that they may listen to the advisement and correct themselves.

وَلَوْ يُؤَاخِذُ اللَّهُ النَّاسَ بِظُلْمِهِمْ مَا تَرَكَ عَلَيْهَا مِنْ دَابَّةٍ  
وَلَكِنْ يُؤَخِّرُهُمْ إِلَىٰ أَجَلٍ مُّسَمًّى

*If Allah were to punish men for their wrong-doing, He would not leave on (the earth), a single living creature: but He gives them respite for a stated term (Al-Nahl: 61)*

وَلَقَدْ أَرْسَلْنَا إِلَىٰ أُمَمٍ مِّن قَبْلِكَ فَآخَذْنَاهُمْ بِالْبَأْسَاءِ وَالضَّرَآءِ  
لَعَلَّهُمْ يَتَضَرَّعُونَ ۖ فَلَوْلَا إِذْ جَاءَهُمْ بَأْسُنَا تَضَرَّعُوا وَلَكِنْ  
فَسَتْ قُلُوبُهُمْ وَزَيَّنَ لَهُمُ الشَّيْطَانُ مَا كَانُوا يَعْمَلُونَ

*Before thee We sent (messengers) to many nations, and We afflicted the nations with suffering and adversity, that they call (Allah) in humility. When the suffering reached them from us, why then did they not call (Allah) in humility? On the contrary their hearts became hardened and Satan made their (sinful) acts seem alluring to them (Al-An'am: 42, 43)*

Often, during this leisure time the tyrannical nations are tested with affluence and prosperity. They are deceived by this situation and consider themselves on the

right way, because otherwise they would have not been so rewarded and why Allah's blessings were showered over us?

أَيَحْسَبُونَ أَنَّمَا نُمِدُّهُمْ بِهِ مِنْ مَّالٍ وَبَنِينَ ۖ نُسَارِعُ لَهُمْ فِي  
الْخَيْرَاتِ بَلْ لَا يَشْعُرُونَ ۝

*Do they think that because We have granted them abundance of wealth and sons. We would hasten them on in every good? Nay they do not perceive<sup>1</sup>*

(Al-Mu'miunun: 55, 56)

وَتِلْكَ الْقُرَىٰ أَهْلَكْنَاهُمْ لَمَّا ظَلَمُوا وَجَعَلْنَا لِمَهْلِكِهِمْ  
مَّوْعِدًا ۝

*Such were the towns We destroyed when they committed inequities; but We fixed an appointed time for their destruction*

(Al-Kahaf: 59)

وَكَذَٰلِكَ أَخَذَ رَبُّكَ إِذَا أَخَذَ الْقُرَىٰ وَهِيَ ظَالِمَةٌ ۖ إِنَّ  
أَخْذَهُ أَلِيمٌ شَدِيدٌ ۝

*Such is the chastisement of thy Lord when He chastises communities in the midst of their wrong: grievous, indeed, and severe is His chastisement.*

(Hud: 102)

وَإِذَا أَرَادَ اللَّهُ بِقَوْمٍ سُوءَ فَلَا مَرَدَّ لَهُ وَمَالَهُمْ مِنْ دُونِهِ مِنْ وَالٍ ۝

*But when (once) Allah wills a people's punishment, there can be no turning it back, nor will they find, besides Him any to protect.*

(Al-Ra'd: 11)

This fixed law of God's punishment as was afflicted upon past nations also works today. If you have insight you can observe it with your own eyes. Those fabulous nations of Europe whose wealth, prosperity, power, might, splendour, intellect and art dazzled the eyes; incessant

<sup>1</sup> Some ignorant people who do not understand the *sunnah* of Allah, when look at their prosperity begin to think that surely these people are believers, righteous and Allah's *Khalifa*, if not why they got the mastery of the earth? But look! How the Quran denies those who consider material prosperity alone the sign of acceptability in Allah's presence.

showers of blessings over them when observed gave the deceptive idea that perhaps they are the most acceptable and beloved servants of God and the source of virtue ----- if you look deeper at them you will come to know that they have come in the grip of the law of punishment. They with their own will and intention have entered into the trap which is pushing them fast to destruction.

The same abundance of industry and craft, dynamism of trade, success of active politics, growth of science and technology, heights of social system which made these nations strong and set their power of deterrence on the globe, today has surrounded them as a net around them having thousands of traps, each trap presents thousands of troubles. Whichever trap they try to slash with their intelligent methods, each of the untied string makes a new trap and each step towards freedom causes further imprisonment.

There is no space in these pages for the elaboration of all the economic, civilizational and political troubles the western nations are surrounded with. To express our viewpoint, only an aspect of the picture is being presented to show how these nations are committing injustice to themselves and how they are creating heaps for their destruction with their own hands.

The English people are committing unique mistakes in recognizing the ruins of their economic, civilizational and political conditions, and prescribing their cure. Among them one mistake is that they considered the increase of population the main cause of their problems. They suggested erection of barriers in the way to increasing population. This opinion associated with economic problems spread very fast among western nations and settled in their hearts in such a way that they began to understand their own progeny the greatest

enemy. Thus the newer and newer methods against child birth -----that could not have ever been thought before----- came into being. Large scale teaching and preaching strategies were brought into motion to strengthen this movement. Books, pamphlets, journals, bulletins began to be published on this particular subject. Societies and organizations came into existence. Arrangements were made to provide knowledge of the subject and practical facilities to every man and woman. Thus the social reformists of Europe and America began a war against their own race and in their zeal they could not even think where this war will end.

The hate of the western nation to procreation reached to such a point that even the foetus was aborted if any conception occurred despite the use different contraceptive methods. In Russia it was legally allowed that a woman can abort her foetus of three months.<sup>1</sup> But in England and other European countries where abortion is not allowed legally, its frequency went up to the level of epidemic. It is generally acceptable in France that the cases of abortion in the country are equal to the cases of deliveries; some of the physicians even claim that the frequency of abortions is more than deliveries. Perhaps there is not a woman between thirties and forties who might have not caused abortion. Though it is a crime by law but it is being done openly in hospitals under the cover of falsely registered ailments. Large number of medicines is there in England which makes the main market of abortion. Doctors assess that four out of five women must have committed abortion in their life time.

---

<sup>1</sup> Presently after a number of year's experience the revolutionary turmoil has become little lesser. Thus the general rule of allowing abortion was abolished in 1937 and now after losing millions of people in 2<sup>nd</sup> world war the Russian government is luring by different methods its people to procreate.



About 10 lac (10, 00000) abortions per year are committed in Germany<sup>1</sup> and about the same is that of the live births. In some of the German cities it was assessed that during past 20 years just double number of children were aborted as compared to live births.

Woman who was naturally provided with strong sentiment of motherhood has become in western countries so cruel that she does not miss to endanger even her life in killing her own conceived child. Dr. Norman Hair says in one of speeches that a conceived woman met him and expressed the intention to miscarry. When she was refused because of legal bounding, she tried to abort by eating poisonous medicines, rolled herself down the stairs, jumped down from heights and carried heavy loads. When abortion was not successful even after all this, she killed herself under consultation of inexperienced quack. Madam Albrecht says that women apply unexplainable methods for abortion such as beating the belly by hard things, causing injury to the womb by different instruments, dancing in a wild manner, dropping down from a high position and eating most poisonous things, even the gun powder. She tells about a French woman who took a long pin and pierced it in her womb so long as bleeding did not start. A large number of women lose their lives every year as a result of these insane practices. It has been assessed that the women who die in women hospitals of England every year, half of them die because of abortion, and the same is the situation in other countries.

M. Powel Bureau writes about a dancer of Perris in his book *"Towards Moral Bankruptcy"*, that she killed her new born by mercilessly hammering a nail in its head. And when she was presented to the court she told, "Birth

---

<sup>1</sup> Afterward the Nazi movement tried hard to cure this epidemic and taking note of its lethal effects started a strong movement in favour of procreation.

of that child had lost all my comfort, I killed it". Medical tests proved that she was not insane and she committed the crime with full consciousness.

Consequence of this race killing is that the birth rate in Europe has greatly lowered down. Compare the birth rate of England and Wales in 1876 and 1930. It lowered down from 36.2 per thousand to 16.3 in England (to 15.08 in 1931) and from 30.8 per thousand to 15.4 in Wales. And in New Zealand it came down from 41.0 to 18.0 per thousand<sup>1</sup>. As in these countries the death rate also has come down with the same ratio, the population is still and without change. But it has been assessed that if the birth rate continued falling, this stillness will not continue after 10 years and population will start falling.

Most dangerous is the situation of France. This is only one out of the world countries where the population is lowering day by day. Birth rate in 1880 of that country was 25.2 per thousand. In 1931 it came down to 17.1. But the death rate did not lower down with the same ratio. The death rate in 1880 was 22.6 per thousand. In 1931 it came down only to 16.3. The neighbouring and rival countries of France i.e. Germany and Italy have the population of 135 and 130 heads per square kilometre. But France shows only an average of 73 per square kilometre. In France 730249 children took birth in 1931 while in its rival country Germany, 1031508 child births were registered.

Miss Sicily Hamilton writes in her book "*Modern France*", this situation has posed a great and deep problem to the political cadre of France which is badly affecting not only France but the politics of entire world. Voluptuous population of France is vacating villages and migrating to cities. Citizens of Italy and Poland etc. are

---

<sup>1</sup> This paper was written in 1933. We have discussed the later facts in our "*Islam aur Zabt-e-Wiladat*"

migrating to France and taking possession of land. An assessment of about 6000 migrants on an average per week has been made. Children who took birth on the land of France in 1929 were about 9 percent outsiders. In this situation the French political thinker have assessed that in near future the French Nation will be taken over by majority of other nations. However, this danger is far away. The danger in front is that the population of rival countries of France, Italy and Germany, is far greater. If France accepts the suggestion of diminishing war weapons, the success in future war will mostly depend upon army manpower. And in this matter Germany and Italy alone will be heavier than France.<sup>1</sup> This is the cause that the behaviour of France in international problem is against other nations.

These are the consequence of that "Intelligent Strategy" followed by Europe to solve its economic and civilizational problems. Except France, the population of other European countries is stable only because the birth rate in these countries is till more than the death rate and the decline in birth rate has not shown its influence on the total population. But what basis the Europeans have to claim that the same ratio of birth and death rates will continue and prolong forever? Are they sure that any day the West African mosquitoes infested with yellow fever will not reach Europe seated in their own airplanes? Have they been guaranteed that influenza, plague, cholera or any other epidemic disease will not suddenly spread in European countries any day? Do they feel protected from the fall of any spark in the firework of European politics as it fell in 1914 in Srahaefo. Then the European nation will not do anything with their hands more dangerous than

---

<sup>1</sup> France has experienced the ill consequences of it during 2<sup>nd</sup> Great War.

any epidemic can do<sup>1</sup>? If any of these situations came across and few million people from the population of Europe were killed, died or disabled, the citizens of Europe will come to know how they have spoiled themselves.

أَفَأَمِنْ أَهْلُ الْقُرَى أَنْ يَأْتِيَهُمْ بَأْسُنَا بَيَاتًا وَهُمْ نَائِمُونَ ○  
 أَمْ أَهْلُ الْقُرَى أَنْ يَأْتِيَهُمْ بَأْسُنَا ضُحًى وَهُمْ يُلْعَبُونَ ○  
 أَفَأَمِنُوا مَكْرَ اللَّهِ؟ فَلَا يَأْمَنُ مَكْرَ اللَّهِ إِلَّا الْقَوْمُ الْخَاسِرُونَ ○

*Did the people of the towns feel secure against the coming of Our wrath by night while they were asleep? Or else did they feel secure against its coming in broad daylight while they played about (care-free)? Did they then feel secure against the plan of Allah? But no one can feel secure from the Plan of Allah, except those (doomed) to ruin!* (Al-Aaraf: 97-99)

Similar kind of nation discussed by the name of Saba in the Quran lived 3000 years before now at the southern coast of Arabia. The population of this nation was spread throughout the coast of Indian Ocean on the one side and the coast of Red Sea on the other side. The trade of all type between India and Europe was in the hands of this nation. Its trade caravans loaded with goods travelled from the southern coast and moved to the western coast along continuous dwellings and shadows of trees.

وَجَعَلْنَا بَيْنَهُمْ وَبَيْنَ الْقُرَى الَّتِي بَارَكْنَا فِيهَا قُرًى ظَاهِرَةً ○  
 وَقَدَرْنَا فِيهَا السَّيْرَ سِيرُوا فِيهَا لَيَالِيَ وَأَيَّامًا آمِنِينَ ○

*Between them and the Cities on which We had poured our blessings, We had placed Cities in prominent positions, appointed stages of journey in due proportion: "Travel therein, secure, by night and by day." (Saba: 18)*

But they considered the blessings of God as curse and wanted that their dense, close and continuous

<sup>1</sup> At last that spark fell 1939.

dwellings should become thinner and fall apart at distance from each other.

فَقَالُوا رَبَّنَا بَاعِدْ بَيْنَ أَسْفَارِنَا وَظَلَمُوا أَنْفُسَهُمْ

*But they said: "Our Lord! Place longer distances between our journey-stages:" but they wronged themselves (therein). (Saba: 19)*

It points to the fact that when their population increased and dwellings became dense as a result of growth in trade, the same question arose there also as it has arisen in Europe today. The words they committed to injustice among themselves (ظلموا انفسهم) hint that perhaps they also tried to thin out their density by using artificial methods. Then what they had to experience?

فَجَعَلْنَاهُمْ أَحَادِيثَ وَمَزَّقْنَاهُمْ كُلَّ مُمَرِّقٍ إِنَّ فِي ذَلِكَ

لَايَةً لِّكُلِّ صَبَّارٍ شَكُورٍ ○

*At length We made them as a tale (that is told), and We dispersed them all in scattered fragments. Verily in this are Signs for every (soul that is) patiently constant and grateful (Saba: 19)*

Allah scattered them, ruined them by breaking into pieces apart so that their existence remained only in tales of the past.

*Tarjumanul Quran: Safar, 1352 AH; June, 1933*

## Some Questions of a Christian Scholar

“Strongly hope that you will enlighten through the *Tarjumanul Quran* on the following questions from a researcher and seeker of truth and provide chance not only the questioner but all the readers to be thankful.

1. The Quran has given four promises about Messiah. The fourth promise is as follows:

وَجَاعِلُ الَّذِينَ اتَّبَعُوكَ فَوْقَ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا إِلَى يَوْمِ الْقِيَمَةِ

*I will make those who follow thee superior to those who reject faith, to the Day of Resurrection: (Aale-Imran: 55)*

Presence of the followers of Messiah and his rejecters necessitates that the followers of Messiah keep following him till dooms day. And his following requires that his guidance and teachings should be protected till the end. It necessitates that Messiah with his teachings is a permanent guide. If it is true then what means the infiltration of Islam and its prophet in between? Secondly, the disagreement of Islam seems against the first admitted truth.

2. If according to Islam Messiah is living in the sky and he is to come; he, before the advent of the prophet of Islam and after also, then what means the advent of Islam and its prophet between the period? It is despite the promise of unbreakable and continued dominance of the followers of Messiah till dooms day.

3.

فَإِنْ كُنْتَ فِي شَكٍّ مِمَّا أَنْزَلْنَا إِلَيْكَ فَاسْأَلِ الَّذِينَ يَقْرَأُونَ  
وَالْكِتَابَ مِنْ قَبْلِكَ، لَقَدْ جَاءَكَ الْحَقُّ مِنْ رَبِّكَ فَلَا  
تَكُونَنَّ مِنَ الْمُمْتَرِينَ ○

*If thou wert in doubt as to what We have revealed unto thee, then ask those who have been reading the Book*

*from before thee: the Truth hath indeed come to thee from thy Lord: so be in no wise of those in doubt.*

(Yunus:94)

According to this *ayah*, when the prophet of Islam doubted about the revelation of the Quran he was suggested to remove doubt by consulting the people of the book. It means that the Quran produces doubt even in the heart of prophet and the book of "the people of book" removes the doubt even about the Quran. Then what is the use of the prophet of Islam and his coming after Messiah? This is about the Quran while for Torah it is written as follows:

قُلْ فَاتَّوُوا بِالْتَّوْرَةِ فَآتَلَوْهَا إِنْ كُنْتُمْ صَادِقِينَ

Say: "Bring ye the Torah and study it, if ye be men of truth."

(Aale-Imran:3)

It is explicit here that Torah may be produced in evidence which is possible only if it is protected. And this again supports the former case.

Hope you will thoroughly and faithfully enlighten us about these three questions which finally have but one meaning. Otherwise some respectable and knowledgeable Muslims may convert to Christianity if you keep quite or give wrong or unsatisfactory answer. And seven persons have already converted to Christian faith. Perhaps you know not till now. Do you know what is happening underground in Hyderabad? And what panic the tract of Qudratullah Shah Khan Mubasshir Masihi "*Letter to the Muslims of Hyderabad*" has created? Many families are ready to join Christianity." (Your Sincerely, A researcher)

The writer of the letter seems to be a Christian who has tried to question us in the guise of a Muslim. It would have been better if he had raised questions as a true Christian; then too he would have been answered with same love as could have been expected about a misguided

Muslim. Okay! He is free to choose any way of raising questions; it is his choice. Our job is to solve his problem and try to give satisfactory answer.

1. First of all I like to point out a big and fundamental mistake that the Christian questioners are generally committed to. The mistake is that you mean by Islam a new religion which was introduced in 7<sup>th</sup> century CE by its founder Muhammad (SAW). That is why you are not able to understand if Torah and Bible were true and Moses and Messiah were right then, what is the use of Islam and the prophet of Islam after them? But as a rule if we want to hold any person we should hold him for the claim he has himself made, not for that which we have ourselves attached with him. When Muhammad (SAW) said that I am founding a new religion and the name of this new religion is Islam? He has never claimed it. His claim is that I have brought the same religion which was brought by Jesus, Moses, Abraham and Noah (SAW) and the name of that religion was Islam (obedience of God) from the very beginning, never Judaism or Christianity. Moreover, the cause of his coming as told by him has no claim that the teachings of Moses and Messiah had completely lost or changed that is why he has been sent. But he says only that (1) Torah and Bible have been changed (2) That in addition to the explicit teachings of God which are present in them despite change, the follower of Moses have established a new system in the name of Judaism and the follower of Jesus have introduces another system in the name of Christianity. And in the foundations of both of them many things against the Islam brought by Moses and Jesus have been added. That is why it was required that again the original teachings of Islam should be presented to the world in pure form without additions and I have been sent for the



same purpose. Now you criticize this claim if you like. What is this way of research and investigation that you attach a claim to a person which he is strongly against to, and then begin questioning not his claim but the attachments you have made with him. Not today, but this mistake is being committed by Christian scholars since long back, and their most of the questions are based on the same mistake. If you are a true investigator, I request you first to investigate with cool heart whether the claim of Muhammad (SAW) is that I have described or that what you attach to him? If it is proven that the true claim is that what I have said, the next step to look is, if it is right or not?

Is it not true that the religion of all prophets was "Islam" (obedience of God)? Have those eternal realities to which Muhammad (SAW) invited----- and on accepting which and molding moral and actions according to them depends the salvation of man----- not been the same forever? Is it possible that in presence of God the salvation should depend on other principles in the period of Abraham and Isaac than in the period of Moses and Jesus or later periods? If you accept that these principles are eternal, then whether the new inventions happen to be the Judaism and Christianity or Islam? You will find many things in Judaism and Christianity which have been given the status of principles (bases of salvation) though they are limited to a particular race or period. But in the teaching of Muhammad (SAW) you will never find anything more than or against the universal principles of salvation. The nature of question will totally change if seen from this point of view. Then the question will not be 'wherefrom Muhammad (SAW) made the entry', but it will be, 'wherefrom Judaism and Christianity entered in

the continuous chain of original religion (Islam) from the time of Adam and Noah, Abraham and Isaac?

2. The *Ayah* you have quoted in your first doubt refers to the Jews as the refuters of Messiah, and the followers of Messiah include both *Nasara* (term of the Quran for Christians) and Muslims. And if following means perfect obedience on each step, the reference cannot be true for *Nasara*; they can be the Muslims only. It is because the *Nasara* gave up the most principal teaching of Jesus (AS) and, as compared to Jews, refuted him another way. In contrast to them Muslims remained on the teaching of Jesus and other prophets before him. All the prophets who have come in the world brought only one teaching i.e. obey only one God, none of them said to make themselves God.

مَا كَانَ لِيَشْرَ أَنْ يُؤْتِيَهُ اللَّهُ الْكِتَابَ وَالْحُكْمَ وَالنَّبُوءَةَ ثُمَّ  
يَقُولُ لِلنَّاسِ كُونُوا عِبَادًا لِي مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ وَلَكِنْ كُونُوا  
رَبَّانِيِّينَ ۝

*It is not (possible) that a man, to whom is given the Book, and Wisdom, and the prophetic office, should say to people: "Be ye my worshippers rather than Allah's": on the contrary (He would say) "Be ye worshippers of Him Who is truly the Cherisher of all: For ye have taught the Book and ye have studied it earnestly." (Aale-Imran:79)*

One of the members of the same noble group was Jesus (SAW) who never tried to rise above the position of obedience equal to the thickness of a hair.

لَنْ يَسْتَكْبِفَ الْمَسِيحُ أَنْ يَكُونَ عَبْدًا لِلَّهِ

*Christ disdained not to serve and worship Allah*

*(Al-Nisa: 172)*

Thus the Christian doctrine of trinity, relating Jesus (SAW) to God and calling him God's son, all are in fact completely against the teachings of Jesus (SAW). And

those who believe in these doctrines commit to blasphemy equal to the Jews.

لَقَدْ كَفَرَ الَّذِينَ قَالُوا إِنَّ اللَّهَ هُوَ الْمَسِيحُ بْنُ مَرْيَمَ وَقَالَ  
الْمَسِيحُ يَنبِيُّ إِسْرَآئِيلَ اعْبُدُوا اللَّهَ رَبِّي وَرَبَّكُمْ... لَقَدْ  
كَفَرَ الَّذِينَ قَالُوا إِنَّ اللَّهَ ثَالِثُ ثَلَاثَةٍ

*They do blaspheme who say: "Allah is Christ the son of Mary." But said Christ: "O Children of Israel! Worship Allah, my Lord and your Lord." .....They do blaspheme who say: Allah is one of three in a Trinity*

(Al-maidah: 73)

According to this, the true reference of the words, "they follow you" (اتبعوك), is towards Muslims and those Christians who consider Jesus (SAW) not God's son but His messenger.

إِنَّمَا الْمَسِيحُ عِيسَى بْنُ مَرْيَمَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ وَكَلِمَتُهُ أَلْفَهَا  
إِلَى مَرْيَمَ وَرُوحٌ مِّنْهُ

*Christ Jesus the son of Mary was (no more than) a messenger of Allah, and His Word, which He bestowed on Mary, and a spirit proceeding from Him (Al Nisa: 171)*

And:

إِنَّمَا اللَّهُ إِلَهٌ وَاحِدٌ سُبْحَنَهُ أَنْ يَكُونَ لَهُ وَلَدٌ

*Allah is one Allah: Glory is to Him: far exalted is He (above having) a son*

(Al-Nisa: 171)

And if, however, the following is not considered as perfect following, the Christians like Muslims also become the followers of Messiah. Then the promise of Allah ----- that He will dominate them above Jews, who rejected Messiah completely ----- will be true to both Christians and Muslims.

3. As I have said in the beginning, the teaching and guidance of not only Messiah but also of all Messengers of God is protected in principle till the dooms day. Muhammad (SAW) did not come to demolish this

teaching and guidance, instead he came to approve, strengthen and purify it from those adulterations which had mixed with it because of human wishes and suspicions. His war against Christians was not because they accepted the teaching and guidance of Messiah, but it was because they did not accept it. He repeatedly conveyed from God that:

يَا أَهْلَ الْكِتَابِ لَا تَغْلُوا فِي دِينِكُمْ

*O People of the Book! Commit no excesses in your religion:*  
(Al-Nisa: 171)

And:

يَا أَهْلَ الْكِتَابِ لَسْتُمْ عَلَى شَيْءٍ حَتَّى تُقِيمُوا التَّوْرَةَ وَ  
الْإِنْجِيلَ وَمَا أُنْزِلَ إِلَيْكُمْ مِنْ رَبِّكُمْ

*Say: "O People of the Book! Ye have no ground to stand upon unless ye stand fast by the Law, the Gospel, and all the revelation that has come to you from your Lord*  
(Al-maidah: 68)

And:

لَوْ أَنَّهُمْ أَقَامُوا التَّوْرَةَ وَالْإِنْجِيلَ وَمَا أُنْزِلَ إِلَيْهِمْ مِنْ  
رَبِّهِمْ لَأَكَلُوا مِنْ فَوْقِهِمْ وَمِنْ تَحْتِ أَرْجُلِهِمْ

*If only they had stood fast by the Torah, the Gospel, and all the revelation that was sent to them from their Lord, they would have enjoyed happiness from every side.*  
(Al-maidah: 66)

And:

وَلْيُحْكَمْ أَهْلَ الْإِنْجِيلِ بِمَا أُنْزِلَ اللَّهُ فِيهِ

*Let the people of the Gospel judge by what Allah hath revealed therein. If any do fail to judge by (the light of) what Allah hath revealed, they are those who rebel*  
(Al-maidah: 47)

But when he saw that the followers of Messiah had lost the Gospel, and keep in their hands only the life history of Messiah in the name of Gospel; they have a

very little part of the teaching and guidance of Messiah, that too in adulterated form, he presented the Quran to the Christians and said whatever you have lost has now come to you in most complete form. This is the same teaching which Messiah gave, and before him Moses, Abraham and Noah have given. You and the nations before you have again and again lost it, but now it is being given in such strong and stable form that nobody can lose it till dooms day. Thus, in fact not in the books of Mattie (متى), Marques (مرقس), Loquat (لوقا) and Johanna (يوحنا), but in the Quran the original teaching of Messiah is present and protected. And this only will remain protected by the will of God (ان شاء الله) till the last day.

4. Your claim, “the *ayah* under consideration necessitates that Messiah is forever guide till the last day with his teaching and guidance”, also requires review and re-examination. These meaning are the product of your thought. Words of the *ayah* do not point to these meaning. Only this much has been said there that, “We shall dominate till the last day over your refuters those who follow you”. How from this it can be derived that now you are the only guide for ever and no messenger will be sent after you to present the same guidance? Alas! Our Christian brothers have not left till now the habit of changing words and meaning of the book.

5. Instead of asking us the meaning of sending Muhammad (SAW) after Messiah, it is better to ask this with Messiah himself whose following words are still present in Johanna despite all kind of adulteration.

*Nevertheless, I tell you the truth; it is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you. And when he is come, he will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment: (John 16:7-8)*

And that:

*But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me:*

(John 15:26)

And that:

*But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you.*

(John 14:26)

And that:

*Hereafter I will not talk much with you: for the prince of this world cometh, and hath nothing in me.*

(John 14:30)

And that:

*I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will show you things to come.*

(John 16:12-13)

You can well understand the meaning of the coming of Muhammad (SAW) by these words of Messiah (AS). Promise of "Dominance of the followers of Messiah" which according to you is up to the last day "in the sense of continuity without break", is not broken by the coming of Muhammad (SAW) but becomes stronger because he witnessed the prophesy of Messiah (AS).

إِنَّمَا الْمَسِيحُ عِيسَى بْنُ مَرْيَمَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ

Messiah (AS), Jesus the son of Mary was (no more than) a messenger of Allah

(Al-Nisa: 171)

وَجِئَهَا فِي الدُّنْيَا وَالْآخِرَةِ وَمِنَ الْمُقَرَّبِينَ

(He is) held in honour in this world and the Hereafter and of (the company of) those nearest to Allah;

(Aal-e-Imran: 45)

وَبِكْفَرِهِمْ وَقَوْلِهِمْ عَلَى مَرْيَمَ بُهْتَانًا عَظِيمًا

*That they rejected Faith; that they uttered against Mary a grave false charge* (Al- Nisa: 156)

وَلْيَحْكُمْ أَهْلَ الْإِنْجِيلِ بِمَا أَنْزَلَ اللَّهُ فِيهِ

*Let the people of the Gospel judge by what Allah hath revealed therein* (Al-Maida: 47)

6. In the ayah

إِنْ كُنْتَ فِي شَكٍّ

*If thou wert in doubt (Yonus: 94)*

Though, the address is literally to Muhammad (SAW) but actually every reader of the Quran is its addressee. The *ayah* means that O! Reader or the listener, if you are in doubt that the Quran is a book of God, then ask those who have books revealed before this, you will know through their witness that this book is from God. This is a hint towards those predictions about the advent of Muhammad (SAW) which are present in the books revealed to previous messengers. The Quran deals with this subject at various places. For example:

الَّذِينَ آتَيْنَاهُمُ الْكِتَابَ يَعْرِفُونَهُ كَمَا يَعْرِفُونَ أَبْنَاءَهُمْ وَإِنَّ

فَرِيقًا مِنْهُمْ لَيَكْتُمُونَ الْحَقَّ وَهُمْ يَعْلَمُونَ

*The people of the Book know this as they know their own sons; but some of them conceal the truth which they themselves know.* (Al-Baqara: 146)

وَالَّذِينَ آتَيْنَاهُمُ الْكِتَابَ يَعْلَمُونَ أَنَّهُ مُنَزَّلٌ مِنْ رَبِّكَ بِالْحَقِّ.

*They know full well, to whom We have given the Book, that it hath been sent down from thy Lord in truth. Never be then of those who doubt.* (Al-An'am: 114)

The Quran has presented among many other witnesses, the witness from the books of previous messengers. And this is not for the satisfaction of Muhammad (SAW) but particularly for the satisfaction of those who believe in the previous books but doubt in the Quran because the witness of previous books can be

acceptable especially to these people. This requirement of witness has nothing such as to say that the Quran created doubts. Truth seekers do not draw complicated meaning instead of clear and explicit meaning of simple text. Leave such methods for those who have ample time to waste in contradictions.

### 7. Before

قُلْ فَاتُوا بِالْتَّوْرَةِ فَاتْلَوْهَا إِنْ كُنْتُمْ صَادِقِينَ ○

(Say: "Bring ye the Torah and study it, if ye be men of truth---- (Aal-e-Imran: 93)

there is another piece which you knowingly or unknowingly neglected. Complete *ayah* is this:

كُلُّ الطَّعَامِ كَانَ حَلَالًا لِّبَنِي إِسْرَآئِيلَ إِلَّا مَا حَرَّمَ إِسْرَآئِيلُ  
عَلَى نَفْسِهِ مِنْ قَبْلُ أَنْ تُنَزَّلَ التَّوْرَةُ قُلْ فَاتُوا بِالْتَّوْرَةِ  
فَاتْلَوْهَا إِنْ كُنْتُمْ صَادِقِينَ ○

*All food was lawful to the Children of Israel, except what Israel Made unlawful for himself, before the Torah was revealed. Say: "Bring ye the Torah and study it, if ye be men of truth."* (Aal-e-Imran: 93)

In this *ayah* the Jews have been blamed that you conceal the commandments of Torah. And this blame is not at one place in the Quran, it is found at various places. For example *Surah Al-Maida* says:

وَكَيفَ يُحْكَمُونَكَ وَعِنْدَهُمُ التَّوْرَةُ فِيهَا حُكْمُ اللَّهِ ثُمَّ  
يَتَوَلَّوْنَ مِنْ بَعْدِ ذَلِكَ وَمَا أُولَئِكَ بِالْمُؤْمِنِينَ ○

*But why do they come to thee for decision, when they have (their own) Torah before them? Therein is the (plain) command of Allah; yet even after that, they would turn away. For they are not (really) People of Faith.*

(Al-Maida: 43)

Two crimes of Jews have been told in the Quran. Firstly, they introduce changes in the book. Secondly, that they conceal, out of their passions, the true teaching of



## Is the Word of Unity Enough for Salvation?

”مَنْ قَالَ لَا إِلَهَ إِلَّا اللَّهُ دَخَلَ الْجَنَّةَ“

“One who said there is no god but God entered the paradise”

First of all in this *hadith* there is a good message of paradise without belief in the messengers even though the strong emphasis in the Quran on the importance of belief in messengers is highly explicit. So much so that without belief in messengers nobody can gain the guided way, success and welfare, nor such a person can have any share in the life, hereafter. Moreover, in this *hadith* we find no condition of good deeds on ones record for salvation. Though good deeds are not a part of belief, yet the Quran has given the good message of success and victory, reward and honour, and paradise of hereafter only to believers and chaste servants. For example the following *ayat* say:

إِنَّ الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا وَعَمِلُوا الصَّالِحَاتِ أُولَٰئِكَ هُمْ خَيْرُ  
الْبَرِيَّةِ ۝

*Those who have faith and do righteous deeds, - they are the best of creatures* (Al-Baiyenah: 7)

جَزَاءُ هُمْ عِنْدَ رَبِّهِمْ جَنَّاتٌ عَدْنٌ تَجْرِي مِنْ تَحْتِهَا الْأَنْهَارُ  
خَالِدِينَ فِيهَا

*Their reward is with Allah :Gardens of Eternity, beneath which rivers flow; they will dwell therein for ever*

(Al-Baiyenah: 8)

وَالَّذِينَ آمَنُوا وَعَمِلُوا الصَّالِحَاتِ سَنُدْخِلُهُمْ جَنَّاتٍ تَجْرِي  
مِنْ تَحْتِهَا الْأَنْهَارُ خَالِدِينَ فِيهَا أَبَدًا

*But those who believe and do deeds of righteousness, We shall soon admit to Gardens, with rivers flowing beneath, - their eternal home: (Al-Nisa: 57)*

وَمَنْ يُؤْمِنْ بِاللَّهِ وَيَعْمَلْ صَالِحًا يُكَفِّرْ عَنْهُ سَيِّئَاتِهِ وَيُدْخِلْهُ  
جَنَّاتٍ تَجْرِي مِنْ تَحْتِهَا الْأَنْهَارُ خَالِدِينَ فِيهَا أَبَدًا

*And those who believe in Allah and work righteousness, - He will remove from them their ills, and He will admit them to Gardens beneath which Rivers flow, to dwell therein for ever: that will be the Supreme Achievement. (Al-taghabun: 9)*

According to our superfluous view the above *hadith* seems to be against the Quran. Kindly enlighten us with your in-depth knowledge and scholarship and oblige.

(An investigator of truth from Nizamabad)

The understanding that the *hadith* is against the Quran should be removed first of all. Almost similar message as is there in the *hadith* has been given in the Quran also:

إِنَّ الَّذِينَ قَالُوا رَبُّنَا اللَّهُ ثُمَّ اسْتَقَامُوا تَتَنَزَّلُ عَلَيْهِمُ الْمَلَائِكَةُ  
أَنْ لَا تَحْزَنُوا وَلَا تَحْزَنُوا وَأَبْشِرُوا بِالْجَنَّةِ الَّتِي كُنتُمْ  
تُوْعَدُونَ

*In the case of those who say, "Our Lord is Allah", and, further, stand straight and steadfast, the angels descend on them (from time to time): "Fear ye not!" (they suggest), "Nor grieve! But receive the Glad Tidings of the Garden (of Bliss), that which ye were promised!" (Haamim al-sajadah:30)*

Look! Here also the same thing has been said as it is there in your quoted *hadith*. As from the above *ayah* it cannot be derived that for salvation, forgiveness and entry to paradise, the belief in unity is enough and there is no need of belief in prophets; your derivation from the *hadith* also is not correct. Similarly the above *ayah* of the Quran

is not against the *ayat* you have presented and the *hadith* also does not contradict the Quran.

One mistake is generally committed during the study of the Quran and *hadith*. People expect to see the Quran and *hadith* like other books where each subject is completely discussed at one place. But here the case is different. The Quran has been revealed in parts at different times, situations and requirements within a period of 23 years. Similarly, *hadith* is the collection of those words of the prophet (SAW) which he said during 23 years of his life in different times, situations and requirements. In both of them one is the central theme of Islam which has been repeated again and again in different ways. The other thing is the details of Islamic guidance which have been considered together at one place or separately at different places wherever required. For deriving a correct inference it is necessary to keep an eye on all related guidance at once, otherwise misunderstandings are sure if emphasis is laid on one piece of information and other related parts are neglected.

For example, somewhere in the Quran only the belief in God is emphasized as is found in the above *ayah*. At other place only belief in hereafter is required (6: 4), at another place belief in God and hereafter is discussed (2: 8). On other place belief in messengers and God is necessary (3: 18), at a place belief in the prophet Muhammad (SAW) and God is emphasized (24: 9) while on other place the belief in hereafter and books of God has been highly recommended (4: 1). Somewhere in the Quran, refutation of God, messengers and angels is termed as disbelief and sin (2: 12), while at other place the pillars of Islam i.e. belief in God, prophets, books of God, angel and hereafter have been discussed together (2: 22). In fact there is no contradiction in these places, but after

discussing the belief system at one place one or two of them have been separately emphasized according to the situation and requirement. Now, if anybody overlooks this truth and claims on the basis of separate *ayat* that for being a believer, only the belief in unity or in God and hereafter or only in God and messengers is enough, and opines that the acceptance of some of these beliefs despite refutation of others can be useful to a man, then it is the consequence of complete ignorance about the language and style of the Quran.

Similarly, at some places in the Quran only belief is emphasized as follows:

إِنَّ الَّذِينَ قَالُوا رَبُّنَا اللَّهُ ثُمَّ اسْتَقَامُوا

*In the case of those who say, "Our Lord is Allah", and, further, stand straight and steadfast, the angels descend on them (from time to time): "Fear ye not"!, (they suggest), "Nor grieve! But receive the Glad Tidings of the Garden (of Bliss), the which ye were promised!(30 :41)*

At another place good deeds and piety together with belief has been made a condition for salvation as in the following *ayah*:

وَأَنْ تُؤْمِنُوا وَتَتَّقُوا فَلَكُمْ أَجْرٌ عَظِيمٌ

*And if ye believe and do right, ye have a reward without measure.*  
(Aale Imran: 179)

And:

وَالْعَصْرِ ۝ إِنَّ الْإِنْسَانَ لَفِي خُسْرٍ ۝ إِلَّا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا وَ

عَمِلُوا الصَّالِحَاتِ وَتَوَاصَوْا بِالْحَقِّ وَتَوَاصَوْا بِالصَّبْرِ ۝

*By (the Token of) Time (through the ages), Verily Man is in loss, except such as have Faith, and do righteous deeds, and (join together) in the mutual teaching of truth, and of patience and Constancy.* (103: 1-3)

Then among good deeds also there is emphasis on one at a place while on the other at the other place.

Somewhere prayer and alms giving is emphasized, at others righteousness and good dealings, chastity, keeping up relations, rights of relatives, lawful earnings and giving up unlawful things are especially mentioned. Every thing among them has been discussed in such a way as if salvation depends only on it. If any person overlooks these commands and guidance as a whole, considers only one *ayah* and infers that the Quran gives the blessing of salvation only on the basis of belief without good deeds or from among good deeds considers only prayer, almsgiving, chastity, keeping of relations or any other thing enough without other good deeds then it is the consequence of his short sightedness. The Quran presents in its teaching a complete scheme for theoretical and practical life which includes belief system, morals, and practical laws all at a proper place. But it has adopted a wise manner of imbibing them in minds by discussing each piece of guidance separately at a proper place and thus instilling it into the hearts. Sometime an event occurred and minds became ready to accept a particular guidance, and the guidance was given at once and as forcefully as to stick firmly in minds. Sometimes the prophet (SAW) was given the responsibility of guiding a particular group and instructions were given according to the requirements of that group. Sometimes a particular teaching was required. Before that the hearts were prepared to accept it through parables, examples of past nations, life of messengers, evidences from nature within and without and then the teaching was provided so that it may effect to the depths of heart and soul. This high level and wise method of teaching and training was adopted because Allah *Ta'ala* planned not to give simply a scheme and a prescription but to establish His scheme and to create revolution in the lives of a party of people for

which gradation, order, situational requirements and human psychology had to be kept in view.

Exactly the same wise method was adopted by the prophet (SAW). During 23 years of his prophetic life he was day and night busy in his mission of propagation and teaching of Islam, reform and guidance. Every kind of people came to him. Every one had his own mentality, capability, moral standard, doctrinal and active life. If he used to say the same thing to everybody he would have not gained the success that he achieved in creating a revolution in history. He was the student of The Omniscient and followed the way of the Omniscient which He adopted in His Book. His teaching was according to the situation. He used words exactly according to the requirements of the situation which directly penetrated into the hearts. Look at all these things which are spread in *hadith* literature to know about the complete teaching of the prophet and how he instilled it in the hearts? If you will not add these units together, make not a composite number and make discrete inferences from each bit you will confront the same problem as it is probable during the study of discrete *ayat* of the Quran.

Keeping in view of this principle, now look at the sayings of the prophet in which he has presented the teaching of Islam in various ways.

Once during a journey, a villager obstructed his camel by holding its string and said, "O! Prophet (SAW), tell me something which can keep me nearer to paradise and away from hell. The prophet aid:

تعبد الله ولا تشرك به شيئا وتقيم الصلوة وتؤتي  
الزكاة وتصل الرحم.

*Obey Allah, do not make partner with Him, be punctual in prayer, pay poor tax and keep rights of relatives.*

Look! The person standing before the prophet believes in his prophet hood, hereafter and has accepted Islam. He does not require all the teaching of Islam. He is asking guidance only to become nearer to God. He teaches him according to his requirement, "Be firm in the basic doctrine of Islam and keep the rights of Allah and his servants."

At another time a villager came and said to the prophet, "Please tell me something that may lead me to the paradise." The prophet said:

تعبد الله ولا تشرك به شيئا وتقيم الصلوة المكتوبة  
وتؤتي الزكاة المفروضة وتصوم رمضان.

*"Obey only Allah, do not make partner to Him, establish prayer, and pay zakat and fast in the Ramadan,"*

The questioner said, "By God I will do neither more nor less than this." When he went the prophet (SAW) said, "Whoever wants to cool his eyes by seeing a man of paradise he should see him." Now, think on the teaching of the prophet, the answer of the man and the later words of the prophet (SAW). A true Muslim ready to accept guidance with true heart, stood before the prophet (SAW). Only this much had to be conveyed to him that for getting entry into the paradise big works, hard labour, deep meditation and whole night remembrance is not necessary. If you keep your belief free from making partners of God and accomplish the duties ordained by Him, you can enter the paradise. Now look at another type of *hadith*:

When the prophet (SAW) sent Ma'az bin Jabal on a mission he said to him: "you will meet the people of the Book. First of all call them to witness 'no god but Allah and that I am the messenger of Allah'. After they accept it tell them 'Allah has made five times prayer compulsory'. When they accept it also then tell them 'Allah has made

alms (زكاة) also compulsory which will be received from your wealthy persons and be distributed among your poor people'. When they accept it also then beware! You will not touch their goods and protect yourself from the curse of the oppressed because there is no barrier between him and God. Another *hadiths* of the same type say:

أُمِرْتُ أَنْ أَقَاتِلَ النَّاسَ حَتَّى يَشْهَدُوا أَنْ لَا إِلَهَ إِلَّا اللَّهُ وَأَنَّ مُحَمَّدًا رَسُولُ اللَّهِ وَيُقِيمُوا الصَّلَاةَ وَيُؤْتُوا الزَّكَاةَ فَإِذَا فَعَلُوهُ عَصَمُوا مِنِّي دِمَائِهِمْ وَأَمْوَالَهُمْ وَحِسَابُهُمْ عَلَى اللَّهِ

*"I have been ordered to wage war against people until they witness that there is no god but Allah and that Muhammad (SAW) is His messenger, establish prayer and pay Zakat. When they did it they prevented their lives and good from me. After that their account is with God."*

In these sayings the prophet (SAW) has stated the constitutional law of Islam which means, when a person accepts the unity of God and the prophethood of Muhammad (SAW) he enters within the boundaries of Islam and become the citizen of Islamic state. The decision whether he is a true believer or not is in God's hand. We have no capacity to decide it.

لَمْ أَوْمَرَنَّ أَشَقَّ عَنْ قُلُوبِ النَّاسِ وَلَا عَنْ بُطُونِهِمْ.

*"I have never been ordered to cut open the heart of people, nor their bellies."*

Security of life and wealth establishes just after accepting the words of unity (*tauhid*) and prophethood. There is no right of oppression after it. However, a person can be punished accordingly if he denies the right of God or His servants.

Look, here a particular man was not in view but the governor of a region is being provided with legal guidance, so the description of the boundaries of law was considered enough. It was not told that everybody will have a right to enter the paradise after accepting unity



prophethood and offering compulsory duties. Moreover, on this occasion he did not order him to teach faith and practical law because the only objective at this occasion was to tell about the boundary of Islam and what legal rights a person attains after entering this boundary. This is just according to the *ayah* given below:

فَإِنْ تَابُوا وَأَقَامُوا الصَّلَاةَ وَآتَوُا الزَّكَاةَ فَخَلُّوا سَبِيلَهُمْ

*But if they repent, and establish regular prayers and practice regular charity, then open the way for them: for Allah is Oft-forgiving, Most Merciful* (9: 5)

Thus, nobody has a right to derive from these legal instructions that the prophet (SAW) kept Islam limited to accepting unity and prophethood and offering prayer and alms (زكاة), and nothing else was important in his eyes except these.

You have gone through two types of sayings above. One type is of those in which particular people were addressed. In these sayings the prophet taught them according to their particular requirements. In other types particular people were not under consideration but the objective was to discuss the legal difference between a Muslim and a non Muslim and the legal rights of a Muslim were under consideration. You find a distinguishable difference between the ways of expression of both types. At one place he is talking as a spiritual guide of people while at another place he is addressing in the capacity of a lawyer and the founder of a new political system.

Now concentrate on those sayings of the prophet (SAW) in which his addressees were those best and selected people of Arab whom he selected out of the Arab society of his time and kept in his own company to teach and train them and make them potentially helpful in

expanding his mission after correctly understanding the spirit of Islam.

Once he was riding and Ma'az bin Jabal was behind him. He called three times with little gaps in between, "O! Ma'az bin Jabal". Every time *Hadrat* Ma'az said, "Yes please O, respected messenger of Allah". In this way when he made his addressee quite attentive and became sure that the listener will listen to him with full attention he said, "Do you know, what is the right of Allah on his servants"? He answered, "Allah and His messenger know better". The prophet (SAW) said, "Allah's right on His servants is that they should worship Him alone and should not make partners to Him". The prophet again called a little later, O, Ma'az bin Jabal". He responded, "Yes please O, respected messenger of Allah". He asked, "Do you know, what is the right of the servants on Allah after they have done this"? He answered, "Allah and His messenger know better". The messenger said, "Their right is that Allah should not punish them". *Hadrat* Ma'az asked, "If I tell this happy news to them"? The prophet said, "No, because they will depend upon it". It means that the common people will not understand its spirit and confuse that only the utterance of the words of unity will necessitate salvation.

On another occasion the prophet (SAW) was sitting with his best companions. He stood all of a sudden and went away. The companions began to worry after a lapse of time thinking about a possible accident and stood to search him. *Hadrat* Abu Huraira (RA) was ahead of all. He reached a garden of helpers (انصار) whose gate he could not find. At last he could get entry through a small drain and saw the prophet sitting there. The prophet asked, 'why have you come'? After listening to his answer he gave his foot wears to him and said, 'go and give happy

tiding of paradise to anybody behind this garden that you find witnessing that there is no god but Allah and also believing in it by heart. When he was returning with the command, first of all he found *Hadrat* Omar (RA) who asked him about the foot wears. He told that the foot wears belong to the prophet (SAW) and conveyed the message. *Hadrat* Omar punched him and said, 'go back'. He ran back and put the matter to the prophet (SAW). *Hadrat* Omar also reached there. The prophet (SAW) asked, 'What made you O, Omar to do this'? *Hadrat* Omar asked very politely, 'My parents may be sacrifices upon you, if you have said this and this'? The prophet (SAW) said, "Yes". Then *Hadrat* Omar requested, "Please do not do it because I am afraid people will depend upon it; please leave them for action. The prophet (SAW) said, "O.K., leave them for action".

Once upon a time *Hadrat* Abuzar Ghifari visited the prophet (SAW) and found him lying covered in a white sheet. He returned and when came again he had awoken. As soon as the prophet saw him he said:

مَا مِنْ عَبْدٍ قَالِ لَا إِلَهَ إِلَّا اللَّهُ ثُمَّ مَاتَ عَلَى ذَلِكَ إِلَّا دَخَلَ  
الْجَنَّةَ.

*"A servant who said there is no god but Allah and died on the same doctrine he will surely enter the paradise."*

*Hadrat* Abuzar asked, 'even if he committed to fornication and theft' (وان زني وان سرق)? The prophet said, "وان زني وان سرق". He repeated the question and the prophet gave the same answer. He asked third time and the prophet (SAW) said, "Yes even if he committed to fornication and theft, against the nose of Abuzar" (وان (زني وان سرق علي انف ابي زر).

Contemplate on these three *hadiths*. There is no doubt in the perfection of Islam in the heart of the addressees. They not only know the teaching of the Quran

and the Islamic law but also follow it perfectly. Whatever the prophet (SAW) said before them had no danger of misunderstanding and that they might consider the principal doctrines other than *tauhid* (unity of God) and the rights and duties of Islam as unnecessary. Therefore, he told them the fact that the true and basic thing in Islam is the doctrine of *tauhid*. The real purpose of sending messengers is to prevent human beings from worshipping every one other than Allah and make them the servants of Allah alone. Welfare and success of man in the world and hereafter also depends upon giving up worshipping gods and serving Allah alone. Whoever understood this truth and the fact established in his heart that godhood is the right of none other than Allah and he should serve, obey and worship only Allah, he will surely walk on the right way and prevent himself from crooked ways. Righteousness will be his nature; he will accept truth, be pious, will serve all those rights and duties which have been set by God. Thus only this thing will make him right thinking, good mannered and sound in actions. As far as the sin committed because of human shortcoming is concerned, his faith in Allah will compel him to repent because it is impossible that he should stick to sin and vices despite having faith.

The companions of the prophet drew same meaning out of the above and other similar sayings of the prophet (SAW) and in fact these are their true meaning. None of them thought that only the doctrine of *tauhid* is enough; there is no need to accept messengers, words of God, neither purity of moral is required nor soundness of actions. How could they draw such a wrong meaning while they had been perfectly taught about Islam? They knew which of its doctrines, punctuality of which prayers, protection of which of its limits, following of which laws

and keeping away from which activities is necessary. That is why he taught these things only to those who were perfect and advised not to tell these to common people. In the *hadith* of Ma'az bin Jabal he himself told about the cause of it, that the common people will misunderstand it. In the *hadith* of Abu Huraira it seems as if he wanted to tell it to the common people. *Hadrat* Omar himself suspected so. But the purpose of the prophet (SAW) was to inform the people of perfect faith. Thus, when *Hadrat* Omar narrated his suspicion the prophet confirmed his view. Similarly, from the *hadith* of *Hadrat* Abuzar Ghifari also, nobody could suspect that "there is no god but God" means only oral utterance because on other occasions the prophet (SAW) has clearly stated that perfect faith is necessary for the entry to paradise. Sometimes he said 'sure at heart' (مستيقنا بها قلبه) and sometimes 'servant without doubt' (عبد غير شك). And sometimes he used other words having the same meaning.

Any way, adhere to the point that the *hadiths* telling about the importance of *tauhid* truly address to those who have entered the boundaries of Islam keeping all terms and conditions, not to those who have not yet accepted Islam. Moreover, the glad tiding of paradise on the basis of belief in *tauhid* also does not mean to accept only the *tauhid* and then keep in whatever type of false beliefs you may have and do whichever sin, inventions and vices you want to do. But its purpose is to tell that the success of a Muslim most of all depends upon the correctness and strength of the doctrine of *tauhid*. Nothing can be beneficial if it is distorted. And if it is correct and strong, the final success is sure. From this angle these types of *hadiths* correspond to the *ayah* of the Quran which says:

إِنَّ الَّذِينَ قَالُوا رَبُّنَا اللَّهُ ثُمَّ اسْتَقَامُوا تَتَنَزَّلُ عَلَيْهِمُ  
 الْمَلَائِكَةُ أَلَّا تَخَافُوا وَلَا تَحْزَنُوا وَأَبْشِرُوا بِالْجَنَّةِ الَّتِي  
 كُنتُمْ تُوعَدُونَ ○

*In the case of those who say, "Our Lord is Allah", and, further, stand straight and steadfast, the angels descend on them (from time to time): "Fear you not!" (They suggest), "Nor grieve! But receive the Glad Tidings of the Garden (of Bliss), the which ye were promised!"*

*(Hamim al-sajadah: 30)*

**Tarjumanul Quran, Safar, 1356A.H.; May, 1937 C.E.**

## Is it Necessary to Believe in Prophecy?

A friend has presented doubt after reading one of my writings "*Islamic Culture and its Principles and Foundations*" (*Islami Tehzeeb aur us ke Usool-u-Mabadi*). The doubt is as follows:

The aim of Islam is *tauhid* and worship of one God. Messengers are simply sources, and belief in them is not the main objective. Everybody is responsible for belief according to his extent of knowledge and thought. Thus if a non Muslim believes in *tauhid* and prays according to his own way but has doubt about prophecy despite using knowledge and thought with all sincerity, what are the rational causes of not considering him saved? Following Ayat are worth attention in this connection:

يَا أَهْلَ الْكِتَابِ تَعَالَوْا إِلَى كَلِمَةٍ سَوَاءٍ بَيْنَنَا وَبَيْنَكُمْ أَلَا

Say: "O People of the Book! come to common terms as between us and you (Aal-e-Imran: 64)

وَلَوْ آمَنَ أَهْلُ الْكِتَابِ لَكَانَ خَيْرًا لَهُمْ مِنْهُمُ الْمُؤْمِنُونَ وَ أَكْثَرُهُمُ الْفَاسِقُونَ ○

If only the People of the Book had faith, it were best for them: among them are some who have faith, but most of them are perverted transgressors (Aal-e-Imran: 110)

لَيْسُوا سَوَاءً مِّنْ أَهْلِ الْكِتَابِ أُمَّةٌ قَائِمَةٌ يَتْلُونَ آيَاتِ اللَّهِ آنَاءَ اللَّيْلِ وَهُمْ يَسْجُدُونَ ○ يُؤْمِنُونَ بِاللَّهِ وَالْيَوْمِ الْآخِرِ وَيَأْمُرُونَ بِالْمَعْرُوفِ وَيَنْهَوْنَ عَنِ الْمُنْكَرِ وَيُسَارِعُونَ فِي الْخَيْرَاتِ وَأُولَئِكَ مِنَ الصَّالِحِينَ ○ وَمَا يَفْعَلُوا مِنْ خَيْرٍ فَلَن يُكْفَرُوهُ وَاللَّهُ عَلِيمٌ بِالْمُتَّقِينَ ○

Not all of them are alike: Of the People of the Book are a portion, that stand for the right: They rehearse the Signs of Allah all night long, and they prostrate themselves in

*adoration. They believe in Allah and the Last Day; they enjoin what is right, and forbid what is wrong; and they hasten (in emulation) in (all) good works: They are in the ranks of the righteous. Of the good that they do, nothing will be rejected of them; for Allah knoweth well those that do right.* (Aale-Imran:113-115)

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا اتَّقُوا اللَّهَ وَآمِنُوا بِرُسُولِهِ يُؤْتِكُمْ كِفْلَيْنِ

مِنْ رَحْمَتِهِ

*O ye that believe! Fear Allah, and believe in His Messenger, and He will bestow on you a double portion of His Mercy* (Al-Hadeed: 28)

Please also tell what *Kiflain* means in the last *ayah* and why *Kifl* is in dual form."

The objective of Islam you have told in your first sentence is not a complete description of the purpose; it is only a part of it. But I will not discuss this aspect to save time. Here I want to tell you that the guidance of prophets is inevitable to achieve even the incomplete purpose you have mentioned.

The question that requires first attention is, what is the true and certain source of knowing about the purpose that you have mentioned? *Tauhid* is not simply the belief in oneness of God but it is the correct awareness of God's self and His attributes. Similarly the worship of God does not only mean to pray Him anyway, but the worship of Allah in correct sense is that a man should keep away from making partners to him and become sincere to obey Him throughout life by all means. Both of these things (i.e. correctness of knowledge and awareness, and sincerity in worship) are known by a comprehensive word "*hidayah*" in Islamic terms. And the Quran says that the object known as *hidayah* is that which is given by God.

قُلْ إِنَّ الْهُدَى هُدَى اللَّهِ

*Say: "True guidance is the Guidance of Allah*



(Aal-e-Imran: 73)

There are only two ways of getting guidance from God. Either guidance is received directly from God or a person who receives guidance is followed. First person is the messenger of God in Islamic terms. The Islamic term for other person is either a "believer" (مؤمن) or "obedient" (مسلم). Thus a person who correctly knows about *tauhid* and has purified his obedience and worship for God the One, he is certainly either a messenger or the follower of a messenger. But if he is none of them he has no knowledge except conjecture and opinion.

وَأَنَّ الظَّنَّ لَا يُغْنِي مِنَ الْحَقِّ شَيْئًا

*and conjecture avails nothing against Truth. (Al-Najm:28)*

And if he has no "knowledge" his worship also cannot be pure because the purity of worship depends upon correct awareness of God.

You have a right to demand that a rational argument in favour of the Quran should be presented. And I am present to meet out this demand.

There is no doubt that the essence of the awareness of God is present in human nature and also it is his nature that he should worship Him alone as it has been said in the Quran:

فِطْرَةَ اللَّهِ الَّتِي فَطَرَ النَّاسَ عَلَيْهَا

*So set thou thy face steadily and truly to the Faith: (establish) Allah's handiwork according to the pattern on which He has made mankind* (Al-Rum: 30)

The prophet (SAW) says: "every child takes birth on the nature of Islam (كل مولود يولد علي فطرة الاسلام). But there are certain conditions necessary for bringing this nature from potentiality to action. And after a little thought it can be known that these conditions are not fulfilled by every person.

First condition is the correct use of the power of observation so that the man may look into the signs of God with open eyes in the nature around him and also within himself and recognize those signs of God's attributes which are present in each grain and in his own existence. But a large population of human beings does not observe it. She looks only the apparent aspects of phenomena and does not concentrate on the inner aspect. Thus the Quran complains:

وَكَأَيِّنْ مِنْ آيَةٍ فِي السَّمَوَاتِ وَالْأَرْضِ يَمُرُّونَ عَلَيْهَا وَهُمْ  
عَنْهَا مُعْرِضُونَ ○

*And how many Signs in the heavens and the earth do they pass by? Yet they turn (their faces) away from them!*

(Yusuf: 105)

وَإِنَّ كَثِيرًا مِنَ النَّاسِ عَنْ آيَاتِنَا لَغَفُلُونَ

*but verily, many among mankind are heedless of Our Signs"!*

(Yunus: 93)

It is evident that those who do not use the power of observation, the door of knowledge can never open for them.

Second condition is that the power of observation in man should be correct and sound so that he could derive correct inferences after correct arrangement of observations. This condition is found lesser than the first condition. First of all there is very little number of people among human being who think and contemplate, and among them too the right thinking people are even lesser as the Quran says again and again:

وَلَكِنَّ أَكْثَرَهُمْ لَا يَعْلَمُونَ

*but most of them understand not (Al-Anaam: 37)*

وَأَكْثَرُهُمْ لَا يَعْقِلُونَ

*but most of them lack wisdom (Al-maidah: 103)*

This rareness of thought and contemplation and shortness of correct thinking is among those barriers

which stop man from reaching the knowledge of truth and turn him to crooked paths. Even though the signs of straight path are spread all over, but one who does not see them or if sees but does not draw correct conclusions, how can he find the correct way? Thus the Quran says, "We explain our signs clearly, but to those who use intellect:

كَذَٰلِكَ نُفَصِّلُ الْآيَاتِ لِقَوْمٍ يَعْقِلُونَ

*Thus do we explain the Signs in detail to a people that understand* (Al-room: 28)

وَلَقَدْ ذَرَأْنَا لِجَهَنَّمَ كَثِيرًا مِّنَ الْجِنِّ وَالْإِنسِ لَهُمْ قُلُوبٌ  
لَّا يَفْقَهُونَ بِهَا وَلَهُمْ أَعْيُنٌ لَّا يُبْصِرُونَ بِهَا وَلَهُمْ آذَانٌ لَّا يَسْمَعُونَ  
بِهَا أُولَٰئِكَ كَالْأَنْعَامِ بَلْ هُمْ أَضَلُّ أُولَٰئِكَ هُمُ الْغَافِلُونَ

*Many are the Jinns and men we have made for Hell: They have hearts wherewith they understand not, eyes wherewith they see not, and ears wherewith they hear not. They are like cattle, - nay more misguided: for they are heedless (of warning)* (Al-Aaraf: 179)

Third condition is that his nature should be as sound and uninfluenced by the society and training of parents as to make him capable of go beyond all screens and look the light of truth transparently. This condition is found lesser than the first two. We have seen stalwarts of knowledge, intelligent, wise and clever people but not free from the influences of society and family. They are running without hindrance on the path the environment has put them on and consider it true. The Quran tells it also an important cause of misguidance.

قَالُوا حَسْبُنَا مَا وَجَدْنَا عَلَيْهِ آبَاؤُنَا أَوْ لَوْ كَانَ آبَاؤُهُمْ لَا  
يَعْلَمُونَ شَيْئًا وَلَا يَهْتَدُونَ

*They say: "Enough for us are the ways we found our fathers following." what ! Even though their fathers were void of knowledge and guidance?* (Al-maidah: 104)

Fourth condition is that the man should be equipped with so strong love of truth and will power that he may resist his own lust and inclinations. It is because that lust initially causes hindrance in the awareness of truth, and if any way a person recognizes the truth it stops him acting according to knowledge and creates obstacles at every step. It is such a strong force in human spirit that often overwhelms his thought and intellect and sometimes knowingly misguides him to stray paths. Leave apart the common people; even the stalwarts who are unique in their knowledge, intellect, astuteness, understanding and insight are not successful in protection from its mischief. The Quran also has declared it as the greatest cause of misguidance.

وَمَنْ أَضَلُّ مِمَّنِ اتَّبَعَ هَوَاهُ بِغَيْرِ هُدًى مِنَ اللَّهِ

*and who is more astray than one who follow his own lusts, devoid of guidance from Allah? (Al-Qesur: 50)*

أَفَرَأَيْتَ مَنِ اتَّخَذَ إِلَهَهُ هَوَاهُ وَأَضَلَّهُ اللَّهُ عَلَىٰ عِلْمٍ وَخَتَمَ

عَلَىٰ سَمْعِهِ وَقَلْبِهِ وَجَعَلَ عَلَىٰ بَصَرِهِ غِشَاوَةً

*Then seest thou such a one as takes as his god his own vain desire? Allah has, knowing (him as such), left him astray, and sealed his hearing and his heart) and understanding), and put a cover on his sight.(Al-jasia: 23)*

More than all, sometimes even prophets are in the danger of robbery by the mischievous lust. So much so, that at a place even the grand prophet David (AS) has been cautioned against it.

وَلَا تَتَّبِعِ الْهَوَىٰ فَيُضِلَّكَ عَنْ سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ

*Nor follow thou the lusts (of thy heart), for they will mislead thee from the Path of Allah (Saad: 26)*

Last condition is that his intuitional abilities should be awakened, his mental frame should not be more dependent on thought process and rational argumentation,

but he could naturally refuse to follow the wrong and find the truth without analogy and argumentations only by the strength of intuition. This condition is toughest but most important for the perfection of awareness. A man's observation may be most correct, he may be well equipped with the power of intellection, he may be completely free from the shackles of imitation and worship of lust, but the truths which are extrasensory and not fully compensable by intellect; sure knowledge about them cannot be attained merely from the observation of phenomena and free intellection. He can become nearer to those truths but cannot attain them. He can rationally say as much as that, perhaps it was so; most probably it is so, or at the most, it must be so. The intellect alone cannot make him as strong as to say with certainty that it is truly so, only this is the truth and reality, and all other things are perfectly wrong and untrue. Certainty, surety and perfect faith is obtained only by intuition (حدس). Analogy and argumentation does not work at high levels of gnosis. There a light appears in mind as fast as lightening and imparts observation of truth within moments; an observation like that of an object before sight. Surety and certainty lies in this observation. Human belief in this situation is not based on shaky foundations of opinion, assessment and guess. But he believes after observing with eyes of heart on visualized object and there is no tint of doubt or some other possibility in the truth of the belief. This is known as perfect gnosis without which a man can be neither perfectly aware of God nor he can purely worship Him. But the light of intuition on which perfection of gnosis is based is not in the grip of man. He can neither know its truth nor can produce it. It cannot also be earned. This is only ordained from God, something named in the Quran by "God given light",

“evidence of the Lord”, “God’s guidance” and “God’s teaching”.

وَمَنْ لَّمْ يَجْعَلِ اللَّهُ لَهُ نُورًا فَمَا لَهُ مِنْ نُورٍ

*for any to whom Allah giveth not light, there is no light*  
(Al-Noor: 40)

لَوْلَا أَنْ رَأَى بُرْهَانَ رَبِّهِ

*but that he saw the evidence of his Lord* (Yusuf: 24)

قُلْ إِنِّي هَدَانِي رَبِّي إِلَى صِرَاطٍ مُسْتَقِيمٍ

*Say: "Verily, my Lord hath guided me to a way that is straight*  
(Al-Anaam: 161)

وَلَمَّا بَلَغَ أَشُدَّهُ وَاسْتَوَىٰ آتَيْنَاهُ حُكْمًا وَعِلْمًا

*When he reached full age, and was firmly established (in life), We bestowed on him wisdom and knowledge*

(Al-Qesas: 14)

Now reflect upon these five conditions. If you deny the requirement of any of these conditions, please tell its cause. If man can find truth without any of these conditions, then the evidence should be presented. If in your opinion all the five conditions are necessary to find the truth, then please tell out of how many millions, billions or trillions a man fulfills these conditions with such perfection that he can attain perfect awareness of an entity like God who is out of the boundaries of consciousness? If you accept that this precious species is rare, then please tell what should happen to those millions of God’s servants who are not equipped with it and if they are equipped then not to that extent? Should everybody be left with his weak resources that he should grope the way with his own blind eyes, and paralyzed feet, sincerely consider anything God and worship it any way? If it is your opinion why do you not say that everybody should cure his disease himself, there is no need of any physician or doctor; every one should search his own way, no need to ask or tell the way; every person should learn by

himself, no need of a teacher or instructor? Is the entire system of the world working on the same pattern?

Human mind has no space to keep all the abilities of the world at a time in one man so that he would become needless of others' help in all activities. On the other hand human needs are so vast and various that each one of it requires a particular ability and every aspect of life is in need of special abilities to fulfill its requirements. Therefore, Allah has created every person with different qualities to meet the total requirement of humanity. One is interested in medicine and meets out the medical needs. The others are interested in law, trade, craft, industry, administration and politics and all of them meet the needs of humanity. All the people of other departments have to consult a particular department in matters related to it. One who breaks this system and tries to become his own doctor, lawyer, peasant, trader, industrialist etc. may commit to this foolishness with all sincerity, the consequence of breaking the system of nature will necessarily be faced, and surely he will pass an unsuccessful life.

As this system is correct in all matters of life, in religion also it is correct. In this field also everybody is not equipped with the ability that is necessary to recognize God and right way of His worship. This ability also has been given to particular people. They have recognized God and have explained His signs clearly. They have discovered correct way of His worship and have told it also. The duty of a wise man is to keep confidence in the experts of this department, give proper place to their teaching in his heart and soul and follow the way of worship they have exposed by words and action. No doubt, he can use his mind also in this matter. But here the correct use of mind is not to depend upon his incomplete

powers and limited resources in searching the way and begin to walk on the path which he considers correct. But the correct way is to search for a right leader, study the character of those who claim to be the preachers of this way to look which one of them shows better and correct way, in whom all those five conditions are found best which are necessary for being a guided person and whose teaching is most practical. The teaching of a man who passes this test should be accepted and followed.

One who will give up this intelligent course and follow the irrational way may be very sincere in intention but will necessarily face the wrong consequences of his mistake. Man cannot prevent himself from the responsibility and bad consequences of mistake committed either with wrong or good intention. If a sick man, instead of searching a physician and keeping confidence in him, depends upon his incomplete knowledge and begins self medication will surely meet the wrong consequences, even if he has committed this mistake with all sincerity of intention. A person who acts according to his unfinished opinion in the matters of law and will not consult the experts of law will never be save from the consequences of his ignorance even if he has done this mistake with great sincerity. Mistake is always a mistake and its natural consequences express by all means. However, ill intention intensifies the crime.

Now I concentrate of those *ayat* which you have presented in favour of your viewpoint. But before it in this connection, try to understand the general principle that for argumentation on the basis of the Quran it is not correct to select one or two *ayat* but looking into the entire Quran is necessary so that all the aspects of problem may be in view. You know that the Quran is not a continuous script having all subjects in detail at one place, but it is a



collection of *ayat* which were revealed within 23 year's long period according to the requirements of the time and situations. That is why the important problems in the Quran have not been discussed in all details at one place but they are spread in the whole Quran and their various aspects have been enlightened. Thus, if you want to know correctly about the problem of prophethood, look at the entire Quran. You will be held in misunderstanding if you select one or two *ayat* and detach them from the context.

When you will study the Quran according to this rule you will find that it never means to say that everybody is free to choose his way and every way which he considers correct with good intention is truly correct also. The Quran says that when Allah Ta'ala sent down Adam to the earth He took responsibility of showing him the right path and clearly told him that the only way of salvation for you is to obey my guidance.

فَإِمَّا يَأْتِيَنَّكُمْ مِنِّي هُدًى فَمَن تَبِعَ هُدَايَ فَلَا خَوْفٌ عَلَيْهِمْ  
وَلَا هُمْ يَحْزَنُونَ ۝ وَالَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا وَكَذَّبُوا بِآيَاتِنَا أُولَٰئِكَ  
أَصْحَابُ النَّارِ هُمْ فِيهَا خَالِدُونَ ۝

*and if, as is sure, there comes to you Guidance from me, whosoever follows My guidance, on them shall be no fear, nor shall they grieve. But those who reject Faith and belie Our Signs, they shall be companions of the Fire; they shall abide therein."* (Al-Baqarah: 38,39)

He also told that the guidance will not reach individually to everyone. But I will select some people out of you to provide guidance and make them messengers. Whoever will accept, with true heart, my messengers and the message brought by them will receive guidance.

يُنَبِّئُ آدَمَ إِنَّمَا يَأْتِيَنَّكُمْ رُسُلٌ مِّنكُمْ يَقُصُّونَ عَلَيْكُمْ آيَاتِي فَمَنِ  
اتَّقَى وَأَصْلَحَ فَلَا خَوْفٌ عَلَيْهِمْ وَلَا هُمْ يَحْزَنُونَ

*O ye Children of Adam! whenever there come to you messengers from amongst you, rehearsing My signs unto you,- those who are righteous and mend (their lives -),(on them shall be no fear nor shall they grieve (Al-Aaraf: 35)*

إِنْ كُلِّ إِلَّا كَذَّبَ الرُّسُلَ فَحَقَّ عِقَابُ

*Not one (of them) but rejected the messengers, but My punishment came justly and inevitably (on them). (Saad:14)*

And when on the Day of Judgment they will be asked at the time of punishment, "Did the messengers not come to you and taught the *ayat* of Allah and cautioned about this day"?

أَلَمْ يَأْتِكُمْ رُسُلٌ مِّنْكُمْ يَتْلُونَ عَلَيْكُمْ آيَاتِ رَبِّكُمْ وَ  
يُنذِرُونَكُمْ لِقَاءَ يَوْمِكُمْ هَذَا

*Did not messengers come to you from among yourselves, rehearsing to you the Signs of your Lord, and warning you of the Meeting of This Day of yours?" (Al-zumar: 71)*

Moreover, the Quran explicitly tells, whoever does not believe in the messengers of Allah, his belief in Allah will not benefit him.

إِنَّ الَّذِينَ يَكْفُرُونَ بِاللَّهِ وَرُسُلِهِ وَيُرِيدُونَ أَنْ يُفَرِّقُوا بَيْنَ  
اللَّهِ وَرُسُلِهِ وَيَقُولُونَ نُؤْمِنُ بِبَعْضٍ وَنَكْفُرُ بِبَعْضٍ وَيُرِيدُونَ  
أَنْ يَتَّخِذُوا بَيْنَ ذَلِكَ سُبُلًا أُولَٰئِكَ هُمُ الْكَافِرُونَ حَقًّا

*Those who deny Allah and His messengers, and (those who) wish to separate Allah from His messengers, saying: "We believe in some but reject others": And (those who) wish to take a course midway,- They are in truth (equally) unbelievers (Al-Nisa: 150-151)*

According to the Quran, a believer is only one who believes in the prophet together with Allah.

إِنَّمَا الْمُؤْمِنُونَ الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا بِاللَّهِ وَرَسُولِهِ

*Only those are believers, who believe in Allah and His Messenger:* (Noor: 62)

And no one can be saved from hell if he does not follow the way of messengers even after it has been clearly stated to him. There is no question of good or ill intention in this matter.

وَمَنْ يُشَاقِقِ الرَّسُولَ مِنْ بَعْدِ مَا تَبَيَّنَ لَهُ الْهُدَىٰ وَيَتَّبِعْ غَيْرَ سَبِيلِ  
الْمُؤْمِنِينَ نُوَلِّهِ مَا تَوَلَّىٰ وَنُصْلِهِ جَهَنَّمَ ۖ وَسَاءَتْ مَصِيرًا ۝

*If anyone contends with the Messenger even after guidance has been plainly conveyed to him, and follows a path other than that becoming to men of Faith, We shall leave him in the path he has chosen, and land him in Hell, - what an evil refuge!* (Al-Nisa:115)

This fact is from among the principle teachings of the Holy Quran and you can find nothing against it in the entire Book. The *ayat* you have presented out of context apparently look contradicting it. But if you study *surah Aal-e-Imran* continuously from section 6 to 12, there will remain not a tint of contradiction. In section 6 the prophet (SAW) has been addressed as follows:

الْحَقُّ مِنْ رَبِّكَ فَلَا تَكُنْ مِنَ الْمُمْتَرِينَ ۝ فَمَنْ حَاجَّكَ  
فِيهِ مِنْ بَعْدِ مَا جَاءَكَ مِنَ الْعِلْمِ فَقُلْ تَعَالَوْا نَدْعُ أَبْنَاءَنَا وَ  
أَبْنَاءَكُمْ وَنِسَاءَنَا وَنِسَاءَكُمْ وَأَنْفُسَنَا وَأَنْفُسَكُمْ ثُمَّ نَبْتَهِلْ

*The Truth (comes) from Allah alone; so be not of those who doubt. If any one disputes in this matter with thee, now after (full) knowledge Hath come to thee, say: "Come! let us gather together, - our sons and your sons, our women and your women, ourselves and yourselves: Then let us earnestly pray, and invoke the curse of Allah on those who lie!"* (Aale Imran: 60,61)

After this the prophet (SAW) has been commanded to invite the people of the book to a clear and transparent doctrine i.e. pure *tauhid* and to tell them that Abraham about whom you are in argument with us was neither a Jew nor a Christian, but he was a believer in pure unity and only his followers have true relation with him. Then it

is being told that a covenant from all messengers (and through them from their followers) was taken, that you have to keep faith on and help every messenger who comes to support your books. Those who break this promise are the evil doers. It is further asked to keep faith on whatever has been revealed to Abraham, Ismail, Isaac, Moses and Jesus. This is the true Islam and whoever likes a religion other than this will not be acceptable and he will be in loss on the Day of Judgment.

وَمَنْ يَتَّبِعْ غَيْرَ الْإِسْلَامِ دِينًا فَلَنْ يُقْبَلَ مِنْهُ وَهُوَ فِي الْآخِرَةِ  
مِنَ الْخَاسِرِينَ

*If anyone desires a religion other than Islam (submission to Allah), never will it be accepted of him; and in the Hereafter He will be in the ranks of those who have lost (All spiritual good).* (Aale Imran: 85)

وَلَوْ آمَنَ أَهْلُ الْكِتَابِ لَكَانَ خَيْرًا لَهُمْ مِمَّنْهُمْ الْمُؤْمِنُونَ  
وَكَثَرُهُمُ الْفَاسِقُونَ ۝

*If only the People of the Book had faith, it were best for them: among them are some who have faith, but most of them are perverted transgressors.* (Aale Imran: 110)

This *ayah* clearly tells that, here faith means the faith in the Arabian Messenger, because the people of books already believe in Moses or Jesus or both. They also believe in the book brought by these messengers and in God too.

The last *ayah* that you have quoted from *surah al-hadeed* invites all believers in the past messengers to two things. Firstly, fear God and be pious to Him. Secondly, keep faith on the messenger of God i.e. Muhammad (SAW). Then it has been said, if you do this you will get double of the mercy of Allah. It means you will get one part of mercy for believing in the past messengers and the other part for believing in the prophet Muhammad (SAW). It points to the fact that those who believe in the

past messengers with piety and rightly follow their teaching will also find some part of Allah's mercy. Other *ayat* also support this:

وَالَّذِينَ يُؤْمِنُونَ بِالْكِتَابِ وَأَقَامُوا الصَّلَاةَ إِنَّا لَا نَضِيعُ  
أَجْرَ الْمُضِلِّينَ ○

*As to those who hold fast by the Book and establish regular prayer,- never shall We suffer the reward of the righteous to perish* (Al-Aaraf:170)

يَا أَهْلَ الْكِتَابِ لَسْتُمْ عَلَى شَيْءٍ حَتَّى تُقِيمُوا التَّوْرَةَ  
وَالْإِنْجِيلَ وَمَا أُنْزِلَ إِلَيْكُمْ مِنْ رَبِّكُمْ

*O People of the Book! ye have no ground to stand upon unless ye stand fast by the Torah, the Gospel, and all the revelation that has come to you from your Lord.*

(Al-maida: 68)

أَفَمَنْ يَعْلَمُ أَنَّمَا أُنْزِلَ إِلَيْكَ مِنْ رَبِّكَ الْحَقُّ كَمَنْ هُوَ أَعْمَى

*Is then one who doth know that that which hath been revealed unto thee from thy Lord is the Truth, like one who is blind?* (Al Ra'd: 19)

And, this also has been said that the people having correct knowledge of previous books also know that the Quran is revealed from Allah and is true.

وَالَّذِينَ آتَيْنَهُمُ الْكِتَابَ يَعْلَمُونَ أَنَّهُ مُنْزَلٌ مِنْ رَبِّكَ بِالْحَقِّ

*They know full well, to whom We have given the Book, that it hath been sent down from thy Lord in truth. Never be then of those who doubt* (Al-Anam: 114)

Thus by taking together the subject matter of both types of *ayat* it can be derived that those who do not believe in the truth of the prophet Muhammad (SAW) because of their ignorance and blind eyes, but believe in the past messengers and live a life of chastity and piety will receive a part of Allah's mercy and be punished softly. (Allah knows best)

## Belief in Prophecy

After studying my last paper the same friend on whose questions I had to write that paper again asks the following.

“Your scholarly review on belief in prophecy gave me great pleasure. But there are still one or two aspects which require solution in my opinion which are as follows:

(A) You say that “there is a potential of God’s awareness and sincerity to His obedience in the nature of man. But certain conditions have to be fulfilled to bring them into action and a little thought can bring into notice that these conditions are not found in everyone.” After that these conditions have been discussed in detail. In this connection I want to say that according to the words of God:

لَا يَكْفِيُ اللَّهُ نَفْسًا إِلَّا وُسْعَهَا

*On no soul doth Allah Place a burden greater than it can bear.*

(Al-Baqarah: 286)

Everyone is responsible according to his expense of knowledge and thought. If training, environment and personal ability become barriers in fully attaining the conditions, why the responsibility should lie on the investigator? He used methodology according to his ability of thought and intellection and he was responsible only to this extent. Making him responsible to blame and punishment is a responsibility beyond his power.

A. You claim that the Quran is not a continuous book having every problem discussed at one place. But it is a collection of those *ayat* which were revealed within a span of 23 years according to the requirements of the situation. Yet you are suggesting reading without break,

*surah Aal-e-Imaran* from section 6 to 12 so that there may remain no tint of contradiction. I read this portion before sending the question and now also but the problem was not solved. In view of the rifts,....., paganism of the people of book an invitation to a moderate way was given:

What was the purpose and meaning of these words and invitation? Apparently it means that if you will follow your true teaching, give up making partners to God, you and we will become equal in the common task of inviting towards Allah. Heart is not satisfied if these words were spoken lightly, formally, casually and only to remove the blame; aim was not to invite truly for a common and coordinated strategy.

B. People of the book were in my mind at the time of writing the question and the *ayat* were presented for evidence. Wherever there is admiration of the people of book for their sincerity, piety, trustworthiness, worship in night, some scholars have interpreted it as you have done i.e. the group had already accepted Islam, like Abdullah bin Salam, Tha'laba (ثعلبه) and the Christians of Najran etc. But it sad that the interpretation is not satisfactory, nor the words of the Quran connote this. For example:

وَلَوْ آمَنَ أَهْلُ الْكِتَابِ لَكَانَ خَيْرًا لَهُمْ مِنْهُمْ الْمُؤْمِنُونَ  
وَأَكْثَرُهُمُ الْفَاسِقُونَ ○

*If only the People of the Book had faith, it were best for them: among them are some who have faith, but most of them are perverted transgressors (Aale Imran:110)*

You say regarding this ayah that little number of them accepted faith and most are disobedient. Here the faithful and the evil doers, both are mentioned together and both are in subject form (فاعل). Considering one of them in past and the other in present and, further, not fixing the meaning of the words *minhum* (منهم) and

*aktharuhum* (اكثرهم) is not satisfactory as may not be hidden to the thinker (كما لا يخفى على المتأمل). But another *ayah*, you have not discussed, is very clear and there is no chance of such interpretation in it:

لَيَسُوا سَوَاءً مِنْ أَهْلِ الْكِتَابِ أُمَّةٌ قَائِمَةٌ يَتْلُونَ آيَاتِ اللَّهِ  
 آنَاءَ اللَّيْلِ وَهُمْ يَسْجُدُونَ ۝ يُؤْمِنُونَ بِاللَّهِ وَالْيَوْمِ الْآخِرِ وَ  
 يَأْمُرُونَ بِالْمَعْرُوفِ وَيَنْهَوْنَ عَنِ الْمُنْكَرِ وَيُسَارِعُونَ فِي  
 الْخَيْرَاتِ وَأُولَئِكَ مِنَ الصَّالِحِينَ ۝ وَمَا يَفْعَلُوا مِنْ خَيْرٍ  
 فَلَنْ يُكْفَرُوهُ وَاللَّهُ عَلِيمٌ بِالْمُتَّقِينَ ۝

*Not all of them are alike: Of the People of the Book is a portion that stands for the right: They rehearse the Signs of Allah all night long, and they prostrate themselves in adoration. They believe in Allah and the Last Day; they enjoin what is right, and forbid what is wrong; and they hasten (in emulation) in (all) good works: They are in the ranks of the righteous. Of the good that they do, nothing will be rejected of them; for Allah knoweth well those that do right* (Aale Imran: 113-115)

This is supported by the *ayah* of the Quran in which the Christians have been admired for piety and for not being proud. If the Quran meant the same type of people which are under your consideration, the words of the Quran would have been different keeping its eloquence in view.

D.

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا اتَّقُوا اللَّهَ وَآمِنُوا بِرَسُولِهِ يُؤْتِكُمْ كِفْلَيْنِ  
 مِنْ رَحْمَتِهِ

*O ye that believe! Fear Allah, and believe in His Messenger, and He will bestow on you a double portion of His Mercy: He will provide for you a Light by which ye shall walk (straight in your path), and He will forgive you* (Al-Hadid: 28)



In connection to the above ayah you say that, "In this all those people who have faith the past messengers have been invited to two things. One is to fear Allah and be pious, and the other is to believe in Muhammad (SAW) as a messenger". Then it has been said that they will receive double reward, one part for believing the past messengers and the other part for believing in Muhammad (SAW). It means that those who believe in other messengers with piety and self restrain, and exactly follow their teaching will also find a portion of Allah's mercy. It is supported by other *ayat* also, as for example:

وَالَّذِينَ يَمْسِكُونَ بِالْكِتَابِ وَأَقَامُوا الصَّلَاةَ إِنَّا لَا نَضِيعُ

أَجْرَ الْمُصْلِحِينَ

*As to those who hold fast by the Book and establish regular prayer, - never shall We suffer the reward of the righteous to perish.* (Al-Aaraf: 170)

But the inference that you have drawn out of all these *ayat* together in the last of your discussion is really wonderful. That is "They will find only that much of Allah's mercy that their punishment will be softened". Appointing the oil-man and yet eating dry.

These are some of the doubts because of less knowledge of mine. If you or other respected scholars respond and solve these doubts the people will be thankful and Allah will bless".

The questions you have posed are being answered in short as follows:

1. If your argument is supposed correct, then not only the one who rejects prophecy will have to be considered as right but the way of every one will have to be supposed true even if he is a pagan, materialist or else. It is because, if anybody is responsible only to the limit of his span of knowledge and thought and he has no responsibility of mistake or weakness, then as the person

who believes in *tauhid* but sincerely doubts in prophesy is not to be blamed and punished; a pagan should also not be blamed and punished who, out of all sincerity, considers a stone, tree or an animal like God. Same should be the case of a materialist who sincerely doubts in the very existence of God. It is because all of them also are responsible to their extent of knowledge and thought and the reach of their knowledge and thought is also up to the point they have reached to. If this principle is accepted, the distinction between a believer, rejecter or pagan will become unjustifiable and there will be no rational basis at all for the preaching of religion because if anybody discards on the basis of his shortness of thought but with sincerity, all those things which are preached by religion he will remain on the right side and not be blamed or punished in this situation.

You have founded this principle in this *ayah*:

لَا يُكَلِّفُ اللَّهُ نَفْسًا إِلَّا وُسْعَهَا

*On no soul doth Allah Place a burden greater than it can bear.*

(Al-Baqarah: 286)

But I say if the meaning of the *ayah* is the same as you have understood, then this *ayah* is against the entire teaching of the Quran and in this situation we have to accept that the Quran has presented two contrasting principles. On the one side it compels man to believe in God, His angels, books, messengers and the Day of Judgment, and says if you do not accept these things you will be deemed rejecters and punished hereafter. On the other side the same Quran (according to your opinion) says that you are responsible only up to your extent of knowledge and thought. You are not responsible and punishable even if on the basis of your paucity of knowledge and thought you reject all or any one of these five beliefs or keep any other belief. Believe me if there

was such an open contradiction in the Quran, no rational and intellectual person would have accepted it as a book of God.

The only solution of this problem is that I have presented in the previous article. Allah has not made man responsible to become aware of Him with his limited powers and try to know the right way of His worship and obedience. Allah Who has created man knows about his extent of knowledge and thought. He knows that the power of thought and knowing ability of common people is not as much as to take flight to a height where the awareness about the extra conscious entity like Him may be obtained. He also knows that the people in general are not as pure --- - because of their natural weaknesses and environmental influences ---- as to compose their obedience purely for the God of universe through their mental labour alone. That is why He has not laid on them the responsibility above their power and ability. He directly provided knowledge of this domain directly to His selected persons and made them responsible to explain His signs to human being and teach them according to their power of reason and understanding.

يَبْنَىٰٓ اٰدَمَ اِمَّا يٰٓاَتِيْنٰكُمْ رُسُلٌ مِّنْكُمْ يَقْصُوْنَ عَلَيْكُمْ اٰيٰتِيْٓ

فَمَنْ اَتَقٰى وَاَصْلَحَ فَلَا خَوْفٌ عَلَيْهِمْ وَلَا هُمْ يَحْزَنُوْنَ ۝

*O ye Children of Adam! Whenever there come to you messengers from amongst you, rehearsing My signs unto you, - those who are righteous and mend (their lives), - on them shall be no fear nor shall they grieve (Al-Aaraf: 35)*

Thus the only responsibility laid on man is to think over the character and teaching of God's messengers. He should be faithful to them and obey them as soon as he feels that they have no personal interests in their preaching, they do not lie, deceive and call to a way which is against piety and reform. This responsibility cannot be

defined as beyond their power and strength. If a man does not accept guidance, with good or ill intention, even after it has been made so close to his reason and intellect and works against it, he will have to experience the consequences of his shortcomings.

You will again react, if a person is not satisfied even after giving thought to the character and teaching of prophets he should not be held responsible for this shortcoming of thought and should not be blamed and punished. I will say if subject is away from the reach of the reason and understanding of a man as far as he is a man, and he does not understand it, then he is helpless because this subject in itself is beyond his reach. But if a subject is within these limits, and a man in the capacity of man could understand it by using his powers and yet he does not reach this understanding, either of the two will apply on him. It is either based in his lust or in the shortness of understanding. Nobody can raise question on his being a criminal in first situation. As far as the second situation is concerned, you may feel mercy on his shortness of reason to whatever extent you like, but you cannot deny the fact that the inference he has drawn out of his short sightedness is not truth. And this is not justice to consider one incapable of finding the truth equal to those who have found it.

Nobody denies that everybody thinks according to his own capacity of knowledge and thought and he cannot go beyond it. But the pertinent question is, if the truth is something that goes on changing according to individual understanding or it something fixed; someone understands it or not? Your belief in first case is like saying , for example, that the addition of 30 and 50 is not a fixed number, but whatever number a person out of his good will reaches is correct, may it be 79, 81 or 80. But this is

such an irrational claim that I believe you will not accept it. Then, surely you will have to accept the other alternative, i.e. the addition of 30 and 50 is always 80 even if the knowledge and thought of anybody reaches to it or not. Now it is clear that if a person considers the addition of 30 and 50 equal to 79 or 81 or any other number either on the basis of short reasoning and good intention or knowingly with ill intention, his calculation will be wrong and his entire mathematics will become wrong till the end, and his labour in calculation will become useless. There is no influence of good or ill intention on the correctness or wrongness of calculation. Nor it is correct to make equal that who has calculated wrong but with good intention to those who have calculated correctly. However, a good-intentioned fool will not be punished equal to an ill-intentioned mischievous person.

2. Whatever was said about the sequence of the *ayat* of the Quran did not mean to negate their interrelationship. The purpose was to indicate that there is no discussion in the Quran on individual problems at one place but one or more aspects of the problem have been discussed at a place according to the demand of the occasion. Therefore, it is necessary for a student of the Quran to look whole of its teaching before making an opinion about a particular problem. If he will give importance to some of the *ayat* and neglect the others he will not be able to develop a correct opinion.

3. It is surprising that you severally studied section 6 to 12 of *surah* 3 yet the problem could not be solved. Even though you could have seen just in the beginning of the 6<sup>th</sup> section that those who believed on Abraham, Jacob, Moses (AS) and other Israelite messengers have been threatened for strong punishment in the world and hereafter only because they did not believe

in Jesus (AS). Think that they were not the refuters of prophesy as such. They listened to the claim of only one person's prophesy and refused it after duly thinking on the matter within the limits of their capacity of knowledge and thought. They refused to accept when their heart was not satisfied. But on that too Allah did not apply the principle of

لَا يُكَلِّفُ اللَّهُ نَفْسًا إِلَّا وُسْعَهَا

*On no soul doth Allah Place a burden greater than it can bear.*

(Al-Baqarah: 286)

That you suggest, but said:

فَأَعَذِّبُهُمْ وَعَذَابًا شَدِيدًا فِي الدُّنْيَا وَالْآخِرَةِ

*I will punish them with terrible agony in this world and in the Hereafter*

(Aale Imran: 56)

Not only on this place but nowhere in the Quran it has been said that those who have doubt in the prophesy of Jesus with good intention but keep away from making partners to God and work piously are excepted from the threat of punishment.

4. The main cause of confusion is that *ayah* of the Quran in which the people of the book have been invited to common words, but which has no reference of believing in the prophesy of Muhammad (SAW). Consider the actual words of the *ayah* before opening discussion on it.

قُلْ يَا أَهْلَ الْكِتَابِ تَعَالَوْا إِلَى كَلِمَةٍ سَوَاءٍ بَيْنَنَا وَبَيْنَكُمْ إِلَّا نَعْبُدَ إِلَّا اللَّهَ وَلَا نُشْرِكَ بِهِ شَيْئًا وَلَا يَتَّخِذَ بَعْضُنَا بَعْضًا أَرْبَابًا مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ فَإِنْ تَوَلَّوْا فَقُولُوا اشْهَدُوا بِأَنَّا مُسْلِمُونَ ○

*Say: "O People of the Book! Come to common terms as between us and you: That we worship none but Allah; that we associate no partners with him; that we erect not, from among ourselves, Lords and patrons other than*

*Allah." If then they turn back, say ye: "Bear witness that we (at least) are Muslims (Aale Imran: 64)*

Which is that word in this *ayah* that caused you derive the meaning that the purpose of these words was to invite the people of books to help Muslims in the cause of inviting people to God? And where it has been said that if you will follow your true teaching and give up making partners to God, then we and you will become equal in the task of inviting to God? What points to the meaning that those who refute the prophet hood of Muhammad (SAW) are on the right path like those who believe in him and have status equal to them?

The truth is that when the messenger of Allah (SAW) presented his claim of prophesy before the people of books (Jews and Christians) and they began arguments against him (as it has been said in the *ayah* 61 little before the above *ayat*), Allah commanded His messenger to invite them to common terms between you and them i.e.

- Worship none other than Allah
- Make no partners to Allah
- Do not make anyone other than Allah your Lord, God, Sovereign and Commander

All these three things were present in the teaching of Moses and Jesus (AS), but the Jews and Christians had given them up. Christians had made God, Jesus and Merry (AS). Jews and Christians both had begun including others in the partnership of God.

قَالَتِ الْيَهُودُ عُزَيْرٌ ابْنُ اللَّهِ وَقَالَتِ النَّصَارَى الْمَسِيحُ ابْنُ اللَّهِ

*The Jews call 'Uzair a son of Allah, and the Christians call Christ the son of Allah. (Al-Tauba: 30)*

Both Jews and Christians had made God their scholars, priests and clergy men.

اتَّخَذُوا أَحْبَارَهُمْ وَرُهَبَانَهُمْ أَرْبَابًا مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ

*They take their priests and their anchorites to be their lords in derogation of Allah* (At-tauba: 31)

As the misguidance of Jews and Christians began only because of the fact that they had given up the teaching of Moses and Jesus, so the messenger was commanded to invite them first to follow the teaching of a religion accepted by them and which also make the foundation of the religion accepted by you. There were two benefits of this invitation. Firstly that if a man equipped with the book will be ready to give up centuries old and hired wrong beliefs because of his sound nature and inclination towards truth, will not feel much difficulty in accepting the truth of Muhammad (SAW). Second benefit was that the invitation to common points will tell both Jews and Christians that Muhammad (SAW) also called to the teachings of Moses and Jesus (AS). Then what is the reasonable cause of denying one who testifies their own messengers?

This is the clear and explicit meaning of the ayah under discussion. How can it be derived from it that there was no demand of belief in the prophet hood of Muhammad (SAW)? How can it be derived from it that if the people of book should follow their true teaching and give up making partners to God they will be considered guided and saved even if they deny or doubt the prophet hood of Muhammad (SAW)? Does this *ayah* cancel the other *ayah* in which the entire humanity has been invited to believe in Muhammad (SAW)?

قُلْ يَا أَيُّهَا النَّاسُ إِنِّي رَسُولُ اللَّهِ إِلَيْكُمْ جَمِيعًا

Say: "O men! I am sent unto you all, as the Messenger of Allah (Al- Araf: 157)

فَآمِنُوا بِاللَّهِ وَرَسُولِهِ النَّبِيِّ الْأُمِّيِّ

So believe in Allah and His Messenger, the Unlettered Prophet (Al- Araf: 157)



لَعَلَّكُمْ تَهْتَدُونَ

*that (so) ye may be guided. (Al- Araf: 157)*

Does this *ayah* also abolishes the *ayah* in which it said that whosoever will not accept the prophet hood of this prophet and his teaching will be in loss?

وَمَنْ يَكْفُرْ بِهِ فَأُولَٰئِكَ هُمُ الْخَاسِرُونَ

*Those who reject faith therein, - the loss is their own*

*(Al-Baqarah: 121)*

Is there any example in the Quran that a messenger was sent to a nation whom she did not accept, and yet she was supposed to be guided and saved? If it was equal to believe and reject a messenger of God and salvation was possible in case of rejection also as it is in case of accepting him, then what would be more useless and absurd than sending of the messengers? Apparently it looks very liberal, but in fact, if you give a little thought to it, relating such a thing to God is like trying to prove --- - God save us---- as if Allah knows nothing.

5. What I have said just now, is enough in response to whatever you have said under section C. But the two *ayat* you have referred to require further explanation.

Who else in the *ayah*,

وَلَوْ آمَنَ أَهْلُ الْكِتَابِ

*If only the People of the Book had faith, it were best for them*

*(Aale Imran: 110)*

The word (آمَنَ) would have meant to believe in, other than Muhammad (SAW)? The people under discussion in this *ayah* by the title of "people of the book", the title itself points to the fact that they believed in God, their book, their prophet or prophets, angels and the last day. Now, please tell who else is to be believes now. Similarly in the *ayah*

مِنْهُمْ الْمُؤْمِنُونَ

*Among them are some who have faith, (Aale Imran: 110)*

If some of these people of book have been considered as believers, what else can be said other than that these people of the book were those who believed in the prophet Muhammad (SAW)? And it is well known that they were very few. Most of them did not believe and they are called perverted transgressors (الْقَاسِقُونَ). The variation of past and present in my translation was only to explicate the meaning, but the translation 'some of them are believers and many are perverted transgressors' also does not make any difference to meaning.

As far as the other ayah is concerned, it tells that the people of the book also have difference of grades. Among them the group that prays in nights, recites the book, believes in God and the last day, lives a life of piety, and not only pious in its self but also preaches to good deeds and forbids from vices, is after all better and on a higher grade than the group who rejects the *ayat* of God, goes beyond right limits, evil doer and disobedient. It would be evidently against justice if both are put in the same category, facing similar consequences. As compared to these evil doers, the virtuous people must be valued and they will be surely valued. But it has already been said that for these pious people also it was better if they believed in the unlettered messenger.

لَوْ آمَنَ أَهْلُ الْكِتَابِ لَكَانَ خَيْرًا لَهُمْ

*If only the People of the Book had faith, it were best for them* (Aale Imran: 110)

And the transgressors must necessarily be shown their place of residence.

Whatever I have said regarding the ayah 28 of *surah al-hdeed* i.e.

يُؤْتِكُمْ كُفْلَيْنِ مِنْ رَحْمَتِهِ

*O ye that believe! Fear Allah, and believe in His Messenger, and He will bestow on you a double portion*

*of His Mercy: He will provide for you a Light by which ye shall walk (straight in your path), and He will forgive you* (Al-Hadid: 28)

is a statement of doubt. I cannot say with surety how much grace of Allah the pious and virtuous people of the book will receive and in what form their actions will be valued? Allah knows it best and as He has not defined it in his book, I or any other person has no right to fix it by his opinion. I can say only this much with surety that neither they will be kept at a place as low as determined for sinful unbelievers nor they will be made equal to those perfect believers who believe in Muhammad (SAW) together with all other messengers and also in the Quran together with all other revealed book.<sup>1</sup>

The government says that we shall reward him for both of his services. Now, would you consider yourself to be right in drawing the inference that a person who

---

<sup>1</sup> This essay could not be reviewed after publication. Now, when I looked it I recalled to *hadiths* which correctly explain the *ayat* under consideration. One *hadith* is as follows:

"By the one in Whose hand is the soul of Muhammad (SAW), there is no person of this *ummah*, be he a Jew or a Christian, who listens about my prophet hood and does not have faith in the message brought by me and yet does not enter the hell." (Muslim)

The other *hadith* say:

"Three kinds of people will receive double reward. One who belonged to the people of book, had faith in his messengers and now believed in Muhammad (SAW) also" ..... (Bukhari and Muslim)

Apparently it seems strange that a person who believes in the first prophet and then also has faith in the second should find double reward, but the other person who did not believe in the other prophet should not be allowed reward for the faith in the first prophet. Superfluously, simple mathematics says that faith in two prophets should be rewarded double as compared to the faith in prophet. But this simply a mathematical error which can be removed after a little thought. Suppose a person served a government efficiently obeying one of its governors. He continued to show his efficiency in the period of the other governor sent by the government.

obeyed the first governor but refuse to follow the second governor, the government will necessarily reward him for his services in the period of the first governor? Whatever answer you will chose for this question will also be the answer of the problem that why the follower of the two prophets is double and why a person after rejecting the second prophet and remaining attached only to the first prophet does not have right to any reward? However, it is correct to say if he is not a sinner and does not commit to injustice and tyranny his fate will not be like those who are tyrannical and sinner.

**Tarjumanul Ouran, Sha'ban 1353 A.H.; November 1934 C.E.**

## Greatest Blame on the Quran

إِنَّ الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا وَالَّذِينَ هَادُوا وَالنَّصَارَى وَالصَّابِئِينَ مَنْ  
 آمَنَ بِاللَّهِ وَالْيَوْمِ الْآخِرِ وَعَمِلَ صَالِحًا فَلَهُمْ أَجْرُهُمْ عِنْدَ  
 رَبِّهِمْ وَلَا خَوْفٌ عَلَيْهِمْ وَلَا هُمْ يَحْزَنُونَ ○

*Those who believe (in the Qur'an), and those who follow the Jewish (scriptures), and the Christians and the Sabians, - any who believe in Allah and the Last Day, and work righteousness, shall have their reward with their Lord; on them shall be no fear, nor shall they grieve.*

(Al-Baqarah:64)

Alterations in the meaning of the Quran have been made in every period. It has been the habit of crooked persons of all ages to twist the explicit commandments of Allah's book according to their own wishes or inclinations and demands of their friends. But no greater blasphemous change is found as has been introduced in modern times to the meaning of the above quoted *ayah*. Other alterations contain cut and concealment of the commandments or striking off a part of Islamic teaching, but this change digs out the very foundation on the basis of which the Noble Quran invites the whole world to the straight path. More than this it gives a heavy stroke to that comprehensive principle which Allah *ta'ala* has chosen for the guidance of human species and for which the chain of messengers and revelation of books from the beginning of the world till the last prophet Muhammad (SAW) was established. In fact this alteration has served the essence of misguidance in a way that even the leaders of infidelity and misguidance had been unable to do. This change on one side provides evidence from the Quran itself to reject invitation to the truth and on the other side it allows the

hypocrites, who are always anxious to be free from Islamic grip, to finish distinction between infidelity and Islam through the tongue of Islam itself. On the third side it shakes the belief of innocent believers; they become prey to the doubt that if a man can find salvation even after rejecting the Quran and prophet hood of Muhammad (SAW), and if it is not necessary for salvation to keep faith on the book and prophet hood, then following Islam is meaningless and it makes no difference if we are a Muslim, Hindu, *Paarsi* or a Jew. In short it is a master stroke which aims at Islam from all sides in and out. The cleverness has a right of adulation for drawing a weapon of misguidance out of the book of guidance! Perhaps no greater blame has ever been given to the Quran.

I have often seen the miracles of this variation in many sittings. I have observed that especially the modern educated people are becoming the prey of this alteration. Readers of "*Tarjumanul Quran*" also have written to me that the modern interpretation of this *ayah* is creating harsh misunderstandings. Writings and speeches of Non Muslim scholars also point to the fact that people are frequently making use of this new interpretation. Looking at this mischief, it seems necessary to fix the correct meaning of the *ayah* and refute modern interpretation with the help of the Quran itself. It is necessary because, when the speaker himself explains and clarifies his words, the other person has no right to give other meaning and explanations to the words.

First of all see the real words of *ayah*:

إِنَّ الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا وَالَّذِينَ هَادُوا وَالنَّصَارَى وَالصَّابِئِينَ مَنْ  
آمَنَ بِاللَّهِ وَالْيَوْمِ الْآخِرِ وَعَمِلَ صَالِحًا فَلَهُمْ أَجْرُهُمْ  
عِنْدَ رَبِّهِمْ وَلَا خَوْفٌ عَلَيْهِمْ وَلَا هُمْ يَحْزَنُونَ ○

*Those who believe (in the Qur'an), and those who follow the Jewish (scriptures), (and the Christians and the*

*Sabians, - any who believe in Allah and the Last Day ,and work righteousness, shall have their reward with their Lord; on them shall be no fear, nor shall they grieve.*

(Al-Baqarah:62)

Same subject has been repeated in the 10<sup>th</sup> section of *surah* Maida in a bit different words. To understand the meaning of the two *ayaat* it is necessary first to fix the meaning of each of the word after analyzing both the *ayaat*. Then we should see how the message given in short in these *ayaat* has been detailed throughout the Quran.

1. **إِنَّ الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا** It literally means only that, “verily those who believed” but in the message given after it i.e. **مَنْ آمَنَ بِاللَّهِ وَالْيَوْمِ الْآخِرِ** (whoever believed in Allah and the last day) the words “to believe” have been repeated. It brings about the question, “what does the belief of a believer mean”? If **الَّذِينَ** means the same persons who have believed in Allah and the last day then it is unnecessary to repeat the words **مَنْ آمَنَ بِاللَّهِ وَالْيَوْمِ الْآخِرِ**. Thus it becomes essential to suppose that **الَّذِينَ** means only the group of Muslims and **مَنْ آمَنَ بِاللَّهِ وَالْيَوْمِ الْآخِرِ** means that man who is in fact a perfect believer without any consideration which group he belongs to. Concepts of groups comprehending minds in the period of revelation of the Quran also comprehend today’s minds. Keeping in view those facts it becomes easy to understand that the Quran is comparing here between those who belonged to the group of believers and those who were in fact equipped with faith. Today also we see that the world differentiates between individuals on the basis of the group he belongs to. A man is called a believer (*mo'min*) or a Muslim only because he belongs to a group called Muslims without any question if he is truly a Muslim or not. Similarly a Christian, Jew, Buddhist etc. are called so only on the basis of their apparent relationship with a group without any concern if he really

believes or not in the basic doctrine of these religions. Similar was the situation in the period when the Quran was being revealed. People were divided according to the apparent relations without caring for the reality. People differentiated between individuals and group by saying this person belongs to the group of Muhammad (SAW), he belongs to Jews or Christians. According to this division the hypocrites were also considered believers *الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا* though they were not.

Herein, Allah *ta'ala* wants to explicate the mistake of this point of view. That is why before expressing truth He is naming different groups and He has begun from the group of Muslims.

2. Literal meanings of “*وَالَّذِينَ هَادُوا*” are “those who accepted Judaism”. Here also the aim is same as described above. It does not mean that the command is for those who have accepted the doctrine and the way of Judaism in true sense. But those who are considered as Jews have been pointed as *الَّذِينَ هَادُوا*.

3. Here also in accordance to the context *وَالنَّصَارَى* means the same i.e. those belonging to the group Christians, not the truly indoctrinated Christians.

4. The word *وَالصَّابِئِينَ* was used in Arabic for groups living in Iraq and Al-Jazira etc. and having a blend of beliefs related to teachings of previous prophets and those of stars and angels worshipers. Here also the word connotes the group as such, not the true believers of the type.

5. The literal meaning of:

مَنْ آمَنَ بِاللَّهِ وَالْيَوْمِ الْآخِرِ وَعَمِلَ صَالِحًا فَلَهُمْ أَجْرُهُمْ  
عِنْدَ رَبِّهِمْ

is this:



*"Any who believe in Allah and the Last Day, and work righteousness, shall have their reward with their Lord; on them shall be no fear, nor shall they grieve."*

Here in fact Allah has denied the concept spread throughout the world according to which the consequences faced on the Day of Judgment will be merely on the basis of group relationship. A Jew understands that the member of their group only will find salvation; there is no relief for any person outside this group. A Christian believes that entry to Christianity is to enter the righteous people; all men outside this group are wrong. Muslims also hold the misconception that entry to the group of Muslims by name, family and some superfluous structures and formalities is equal to become a true Muslim. They have a status above those who have not entered this group. In response to this wrong conception Allah *t'ala* says: true distinction of a man from the other man is not because of such group relations but it is based upon faith and virtuous deeds. One who is called a believer but is not equipped with faith and virtuous deeds is not a true believer and his result cannot be same as is definitely explained for the believers. Similarly, a man belonging to Jews, Christians or a Sabains becomes equipped with faith and good deeds he is in fact not a Jew, Christian or Sabain; he is a believer and his result will be as has been fixed for faithful and pious people. But if he is not equipped with these attributes his group relationship will not benefit him as in case of mere relationship with Muslim's group is not beneficial.

At other places in the Noble Quran this group worship of Jews and Christians has been discussed and condemned.

قَالُوا لَنْ يَدْخُلَ الْجَنَّةَ إِلَّا مَنْ كَانَ هُودًا أَوْ نَصَارَىٰ  
تِلْكَ أَمَانِيُّهُمْ قُلْ هَاتُوا بُرْهَانَكُمْ إِنْ كُنْتُمْ صَادِقِينَ بَلَىٰ  
مَنْ أَسْلَمَ وَجْهَهُ لِلَّهِ وَهُوَ مُحْسِنٌ فَلَهُ أَجْرُهُ عِنْدَ رَبِّهِ وَلَا  
خَوْفٌ عَلَيْهِمْ وَلَا هُمْ يَحْزَنُونَ

*And they say: "None shall enter Paradise unless he becomes a Jew or a Christian ".Those are their (vain) desires. Say: "Produce your proof if ye are truthful." Nay,-whoever submits His whole self to Allah and is a doer of good, - He will get his reward with his Lord; on such shall be no fear, nor shall they grieve.*

(Al-Baqarah: 111,112)

وَقَالَتِ الْيَهُودُ وَالنَّصَارَىٰ نَحْنُ أَبْنَاءُ اللَّهِ وَأَحِبَّاءُ ۚ قُلْ فَلِمَ يُعَذِّبُكُمْ بِذُنُوبِكُمْ بَلْ أَنْتُمْ بَشَرٌ مِّمَّنْ خَلَقَ

*Both the Jews and the Christians say: "We are sons of Allah, and his beloved ".Say: "Why then doth He punish you for your sins? Nay, ye are but men, - of the men he hath created:*

(Al-Maidah: 18)

قَالُوا لَنْ تَمَسَّنَا النَّارُ إِلَّا أَيَّامًا مَّعْدُودَاتٍ سَوْعَرَهُمْ فِي دِينِهِمْ  
مَا كَانُوا يَقْتَرُونَ ۖ فَكَيْفَ إِذَا جُمِعْنَا لَهُمْ لَيُّومٍ لَّارِيبَ فِيهِ  
وُوقِيَتْ كُلُّ نَفْسٍ مَّا كَسَبَتْ وَهُمْ لَا يُظْلَمُونَ

*they say: "The Fire shall not touch us but for a few numbered days": For their forgeries deceive them as to their own religion. But how (will they fare) when we gather them together against a day about which there is no doubt, and each soul will be paid out just what it has earned ,without (favour or) injustice (Aale Imran: 24, 25)*

*And everybody will be paid back according to his doings. None will face injustice but every one will receive his right.*

قُلْ إِنْ كَانَتْ لَكُمْ الدَّارُ الْآخِرَةُ عِنْدَ اللَّهِ خَالِصَةً مِّنْ دُونِ  
النَّاسِ فَتَمَتُّوا أَلْمُوتَ إِنْ كُنْتُمْ صَادِقِينَ

Say: "If the last Home, with Allah, be for you specially, and not for anyone else, then seek ye for death, if ye are sincere."  
(Al-Baqarah: 94)

All these *await* mention the truth that Allah has no special relations with any group and no nation is the custodian of salvation. You have no right of special treatment because you have taken birth in a particular nation, or have relations with certain party; everybody is equal as a human being in presence of God. Neither a nation as such is pretty and acceptable in His presence, nor is any one rejected because of his name or relation to a group. There is no weight of relations and nationalities; only rules and realities have weight. If you will have faith with true heart and do good deeds you will get a good reward and if you are without faith and good deeds, nothing could save you from bad results, whichever group you might belong to. Same subject has been dealt with addressing Muslims as well as the people of the book.

لَيْسَ بِأَمَانِيكُمْ وَلَا أَمَانِي أَهْلِ الْكِتَابِ مَنْ يَعْمَلْ سُوءً يُجْزَ  
بِهِ وَلَا يَجِدْ لَهُ مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ وَلِيًّا وَلَا نَصِيرًا ○ وَمَنْ يَعْمَلْ  
مِنَ الصَّالِحَاتِ مِنْ ذَكَرٍ أَوْ أَنْتُمْ وَهُوَ مُؤْمِنٌ فَأُولَٰئِكَ  
يَدْخُلُونَ الْجَنَّةَ وَلَا يُظْلَمُونَ نَقِيرًا ○

*Not your desires, nor those of the People of the Book (can prevail): whoever works evil, will be requited accordingly.*

*N or will he find, besides Allah, any protector or helper. If any do deeds of righteousness, - be they male or female - and have faith, they will enter Heaven, and not the least injustice will be done to them.*

(Al-Nisa: 123,124)

The same fact has been discussed in different words in the *ayaat* under consideration. The context in which this *ayah* has been revealed has no discussion on the items of faith and rules and regulations for being pious. The

objective of these *ayaat* was to tell that only realities are trusted in presence of God not the apparent phenomena, superfluous structures and ostentatious relations for which people of the world are fighting and killing each other. Now, if any person says: because in this *ayah* only belief in God and the Last Day has been included therefore, only these two things are enough for salvation; after it there is no need to accept any prophet, book or to follow any law (*shari'at*), or he says that the objective of the Quran is none other than that a Hindu should become strong Hindu, a Jew should live as a true Jew and every person should earnestly follow his own religion; as far as the faith in the Quran and prophet hood of Muhammad (SAW) is concerned, it is not a necessary condition for salvation, then for such a person we will plainly say that he does not explain the Quran but makes fun of it. His claim cannot be accepted so long as the entire Quran is not refuted except these two *ayaat*.

No doubt that belief in God is the basic truth of religion (دين). That is why, first of all this has been discussed in the *ayah* under discussion. But belief in God does mean only to accept the presence and singularity of Allah. The Quran tells us in explicit words what it means by belief in Allah.

بَلَىٰ مَنْ أَسْلَمَ وَجْهَهُ لِلَّهِ وَهُوَ مُحْسِنٌ فَلَهُ أَجْرُهُ عِنْدَ رَبِّهِ  
وَلَا خَوْفٌ عَلَيْهِمْ وَلَا هُمْ يَحْزَنُونَ ٥

*Nay,-whoever submits His whole self to Allah and is a doer of good, - He will get his reward with his Lord; on such shall be no fear, nor shall they grieve.*

(Al-Baqarah:112)

Here belief in Allah has been explained by the word Islam. It means to make yourself obedient of Allah to please Him. And its reward has been told exactly the same as it is there in the *ayah*:

إِنَّ الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا وَالَّذِينَ هَادُوا

*Those who believe (in the Qur'an), and those who follow the Jewish scriptures* (Al-Baqarah: 62)

That is they shall have their reward with their Lord; on them shall be no fear, nor shall they grieve.

Moreover, it has been further explained that such Islam or *Iman* can be obtained only through the heavenly books; it is not possible that a person who makes a doctrine about God and the last day out of his own thought and a theory of high moral, or select some teachings of a religion and others of another and make a patchwork, and he may be considered faithful in the sight of the Quran.

قُولُوا آمَنَّا بِاللَّهِ وَمَا أُنزِلَ إِلَيْنَا وَمَا أُنزِلَ إِلَىٰ إِبْرَاهِيمَ ۝

*Say yes: "We believe in Allah and the revelation given to us, and to Abraham* (Al-Baqarah: 136)

وَمَا أُوتِيَ النَّبِيُّونَ مِنْ رَبِّهِمْ لَا نُفَرِّقُ بَيْنَ أَحَدٍ مِنْهُمْ وَنَحْنُ لَهُ مُسْلِمُونَ ۝ فَإِنْ آمَنُوا بِمِثْلِ مَا آمَنْتُمْ بِهِ فَقَدْ اهْتَدَوْا وَإِنْ تَوَلَّوْا فَإِنَّمَاهُمْ فِي شِقَاقِ ۝

*And that given to Moses, Jesus, to (all) prophets from their Lord: We make no difference between one and another of them: And we bow to Allah (in Islam). So if they believe as ye believe, they are indeed on the right path; but if they turn back, it is they who are in schism.*

(Al-Baqarah: 136,137)

Same subject has been repeated in *surah Aal-e-Imran*:

نَحْنُ لَهُ مُسْلِمُونَ

*And to Allah do we bow our will (in Islam).* (Aal-e-Imran:82)

And after that is said:

وَمَنْ يَتَّبِعْ غَيْرَ الْإِسْلَامِ دِينًا فَلَنْ يُقْبَلَ مِنْهُ وَهُوَ فِي الْآخِرَةِ مِنَ الْخَاسِرِينَ

*If anyone desires a religion other than Islam (submission to Allah), never will it be accepted of him; and in the Hereafter He will be in the ranks of those who have lost (All spiritual good).* (Aal-e-Imran:85)

At another place in the same *surah* it has been said:

فَإِنْ حَاجُّوكَ فَقُلْ أَسْلَمْتُ وَجْهِيَ لِلَّهِ وَمَنِ اتَّبَعِيَ وَقُلْ  
لِّلَّذِينَ أُوتُوا الْكِتَابَ وَالْأُمِّيِّينَ ءَ أَسْلَمْتُمْ فَإِنْ أَسْلَمُوا  
فَقَدْ اهْتَدَوْا

*So if they dispute with thee ,say: "I have submitted My whole self to Allah and so have those who follow me ". And say to the People of the Book and to those who are unlearned: "Do ye (also (submit yourselves?" If they do, they are in right guidance* (Aal-e-Imran: 200)

These *ayaat* tell with perfect clarity that the *ayaat* under discussion do not mean simply to accept God but it is to accept Him according to the teachings of prophets and heavenly books, and it is what is known as Islam. The Quran repeats again and again in definite words that the medium of prophet and Allah's book is necessary for the guidance of man. One cannot receive guidance by neglecting this medium. And on this basis one cannot be a believer so long as he does not believe in prophets also:

إِنَّمَا الْمُؤْمِنُونَ الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا بِاللَّهِ وَرَسُولِهِ

*Only those are believers, who believe in Allah and His Messenger* (Al-Noor: 62)

وَمَنْ يَكْفُرْ بِاللَّهِ وَمَلَائِكَتِهِ وَكُتُبِهِ وَرُسُلِهِ وَالْيَوْمِ الْآخِرِ فَقَدْ  
ضَلَّ ضَلَالًا بَعِيدًا

*Any who denieth Allah, His angels, His Books, His Messengers, and the Day of Judgment, hath gone far, far astray.* (Al-Nisaa:136)

وَكَانَ مِنْ قَرْيَةٍ عَتَتْ عَنْ أَمْرِ رَبِّهَا وَرُسُلِهِ فَحَاسِبْنَهَا  
حِسَابًا شَدِيدًا وَعَدَّ بِهَا عَذَابًا نَكِرًا ۖ فَذَاقَتْ وَبَالَ أَمْرِهَا  
وَكَانَ عَاقِبَةُ أَمْرِهَا خُسْرًا

*How many populations that insolently opposed the Command of their Lord and of His messengers, did We not then call to account,- to severe account?- and We imposed on them an exemplary Punishment Then did they taste the evil result of their conduct, and the End of their conduct was Perdition* (At-talaq: 8,9)

These are some of those *ayaat* which promptly tell that the belief in God and belief in prophet are inseparable and a refuter of prophesy cannot be a believer of God. They also tell that the belief in books and prophets does not mean simply to declare the greatness and dignity of prophets and affirm by tongue that we accept them and also their books. Only this kind of affirmation of dignity as shown by the followers of Brahmu Samaj or Mr. Gandhi is not enough, but active following and obedience is necessary and to accept the rule that the word of prophet is the final authority is an unavoidable condition for faith, and that a believer has no right to present his own argument in contrast to this authority.

وَمَا أَرْسَلْنَا مِنْ رَّسُولٍ إِلَّا لِيُطَاعَ بِإِذْنِ اللَّهِ

*We sent not a messenger, but to be obeyed, in accordance with the will of Allah* (Al-Nisa: 64)

مَنْ يُطِيعِ الرَّسُولَ فَقَدْ أَطَاعَ اللَّهَ ۝

*He who obeys the Messenger, obeys Allah* (Al-Nisa: 80)

وَمَنْ يُشَاقِقِ الرَّسُولَ مِنْ بَعْدِ مَا تَبَيَّنَ لَهُ الْهُدَىٰ وَيَتَّبِعْ

غَيْرَ سَبِيلِ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ نُوَلِّهِ مَا تَوَلَّىٰ وَنُصْلِهِ جَهَنَّمَ ۖ وَسَاءَتْ

مَصِيرًا ۝

*If anyone contends with the Messenger even after guidance has been plainly conveyed to him, and follows a path other than that becoming to men of Faith, We shall leave him in the path he has chosen, and land him in Hell,- what an evil refuge!* (Al-Nisa: 115)

وَمَا كَانَ لِمُؤْمِنٍ وَلَا مُؤْمِنَةٍ إِذَا قَضَى اللَّهُ وَرَسُولُهُ أَمْرًا أَنْ  
يَكُونُوا لَهُمُ الْخِيَرَةُ مِنْ أَمْرِهِمْ. وَمَنْ يَعْصِ اللَّهَ وَرَسُولَهُ فَقَدْ  
صَلَ صَالًا لَا مُبِينًا ۝

*It is not fitting for a Believer, man or woman, when a matter has been decided by Allah and His Messenger to have any option about their decision: if any one disobeys Allah and His Messenger, he is indeed on a clearly wrong Path.* (Al-Ahzab:36)

فَلَا وَرَبِّكَ لَا يُؤْمِنُونَ حَتَّى يُحَكِّمُوكَ فِي مَا شَجَرَ بَيْنَهُمْ  
ثُمَّ لَا يَجِدُوا فِي أَنْفُسِهِمْ حَرَجًا مِمَّا قَضَيْتَ وَيُسَلِّمُوا  
تَسْلِيمًا ۝

*But no, by the Lord, they can have no (real) Faith, until they make thee judge in all disputes between them, and find in their souls no resistance against Thy decisions, but accept them with the fullest conviction.* (Al-Nisa: 65)

With this the stress has been given on the fact that not only belief in one prophet or one book or some books is enough but belief in all prophets and all books is necessary; even if a single prophet is denied it will be deemed as denying Allah and all prophets.

إِنَّ الَّذِينَ يَكْفُرُونَ بِاللَّهِ وَرُسُلِهِ وَيُرِيدُونَ أَنْ يُفَرِّقُوا بَيْنَ  
اللَّهِ وَرُسُلِهِ وَيَقُولُونَ نُؤْمِنُ بِبَعْضٍ وَنَكْفُرُ بِبَعْضٍ وَيُرِيدُونَ  
أَنْ يَتَّخِذُوا بَيْنَ ذَلِكَ سَبِيلًا أُولَٰئِكَ هُمُ الْكَافِرُونَ حَقًّا ۝

*Those who deny Allah and His messengers, and (those who) wish to separate Allah from His messengers, saying: "We believe in some but reject others": And (those who) wish to take a course midway,- they are in truth (equally) unbelievers; and we have prepared for unbelievers a humiliating punishment. (Al-Nisa: 150,151)*

This is because all prophets make an indivisible Deen(دين) group and invite to single religion . Therefore, the denial of one is the denial of all but it is the denial of



religion. If 10 persons make same claim, you have no choice other than to affirm or deny all. If a person calls nine of them true and one as false he will in fact deny all the 10, moreover, he will deny the claim itself in which all the 10 are united.

يَا أَيُّهَا الرُّسُلُ

O ye messengers! (Al-Momin: 51)

وَإِنَّ هَذِهِ أُمَّتُكُمْ أُمَّةً وَاحِدَةً وَأَنَا رَبُّكُمْ فَاتَّقُونِ

*And verily this Brotherhood of yours is a single Brotherhood, and I am your Lord and Cherisher: therefore fear Me (and no other) (Al-Momin: 53)*

شَرَعَ لَكُمْ مِنَ الدِّينِ مَا وَصَّى بِهِ نُوحًا وَالَّذِي أَوْحَيْنَا

إِلَيْكَ وَمَا وَصَّيْنَا بِهِ إِبْرَاهِيمَ وَمُوسَى وَعِيسَى أَنْ أَقِيمُوا

الدِّينَ وَلَا تَتَفَرَّقُوا فِيهِ

*The same religion has He established for you as that which He enjoined on Noah - the which We have sent by inspiration to thee - and that which We enjoined on Abraham, Moses, and Jesus: Namely, that ye should remain steadfast in religion, and make no divisions therein: (Al-Shura: 13)*

According to this general principle it becomes compulsory to confirm to Muhammad (SAW) and the Quran because anybody who believes in all prophets but refuses to believe him or confirms to all heavenly books except the Quran, he will in fact deny all prophets and books, and even the religion of God as discussed above. This fact has been explicated in the Quran not at one but at several places and on the same basis the believers of the past books have been asked to believe in Muhammad (SAW) and the Quran and they have been clearly told, if you do not believe in them you surely commit to infidelity (كفر).

وَلَمَّا جَاءَهُمْ كِتَابٌ مِنْ عِنْدِ اللَّهِ مُصَدِّقٌ لِمَا مَعَهُمْ وَكَانُوا  
 مِنْ قَبْلُ يَسْتَفْتِحُونَ عَلَى الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا فَلَمَّا جَاءَهُمْ  
 مَا عَرَفُوا كَفَرُوا بِهِ فَلَعْنَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَى الْكَافِرِينَ ۝

*And when there comes to them a Book from Allah, confirming what is with them -,although from of old they had prayed for victory against those without Faith -,when there comes to them that which they (should) have recognised, they refuse to believe in it but the curse of Allah is on those without Faith. (Al-Baqarah:89)*

وَإِذَا قِيلَ لَهُمْ آمِنُوا بِمَا أَنْزَلَ اللَّهُ قَالُوا تُوْمِنُ بِمَا أَنْزَلَ  
 عَلَيْنَا وَنَكْفُرُونَ بِمَا وَرَاءَ هَٰؤُلَاءِ ۝

*When it is said to them, "Believe in what Allah Hath sent down, "they say, "We believe in what was sent down to us:" yet they reject all besides, (Al-Baqarah: 91)*

نَزَّلَ عَلَيْكَ الْكِتَابَ بِالْحَقِّ مُصَدِّقًا لِمَا بَيْنَ يَدَيْهِ ۝

*It is He Who sent down to thee (step by step), in truth, the Book, confirming what went before it; (Aal-e-Imran: 3)*

إِنَّ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا بِآيَاتِ اللَّهِ لَهُمْ عَذَابٌ شَدِيدٌ

*Then those who reject Faith in the Signs of Allah will suffer the severest penalty (Aal-e-Imran: 4)*

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ أُوتُوا الْكِتَابَ آمِنُوا بِمَا نَزَّلْنَا مُصَدِّقًا لِمَا مَعَكُمْ  
 مِنْ قَبْلُ أَنْ تَطْمِئِسَ وُجُوهُ فَرَدَّهَا عَلَىٰ أَذْبَارِهَا أَوْ نَلْعَنَهُمْ  
 كَمَا لَعَنَّا أَصْحَابَ السَّبْتِ

*O ye People of the Book !believe in what We have (now) revealed, confirming what was (already) with you ,before We change the face and fame of some (of you) beyond all recognition, and turn them hind wards, or curse them as We cursed the Sabbath-breakers, (Al-Nisa: 47)*

Even more clear and explicit are the words of the following ayah:

وَأَنَّ مِنْ أَهْلِ الْكِتَابِ لَمَنْ يُؤْمِنُ بِاللَّهِ وَمَا أُنْزِلَ إِلَيْكُمْ وَمَا  
أُنْزِلَ إِلَيْهِمْ

*And there are, certainly, among the People of the Book, those who believe in Allah, in the revelation to you, and in the revelation to them* (Aal-e-Imran: 199)

أُولَئِكَ لَهُمْ أَجْرُهُمْ عِنْدَ رَبِّهِمْ ۝

*For them is a reward with their Lord* (Aal-e-Imran: 199)

This last *ayah* is very clearly explaining the *ayah* under discussion. There it was said, whosoever will believe in Allah and the Last Day from among the Muslims, Jews, Christians and Sabains will be rewarded in presence of their Lord. Here this fact has been further explained that after Muhammad (SAW) and the Quran, only those people of the book will be rewarded who having faith in Allah and His books revealed in the past will also have faith in the book revealed to Muhammad (SAW). Which commentary will be more explaining than this?

Notwithstanding the above facts, if anybody says: "according to the Quran it is enough for being guided and reward winner that a Jew should become a staunch Jew and a Christian should become true to his religion", he makes commentary against the explicit words of the Quran. It is true that the Quran invites Jews and Christians to abide by the *Toraat* and the *Injeel*, but it is also known what this invitation means? It never means that the Jews and Christians should obey the *Toraat* and the *Injeel* and leave aside the Quran and Muhammad (SAW). But the true meaning of this is to follow the given guidance. Thus it has been plainly announced in the Quran that now the true following of the *Toraat* and *Injeel* is the following of the Quran:

يَا أَهْلَ الْكِتَابِ لَسْتُمْ عَلَى شَيْءٍ حَتَّى تُقِيمُوا التَّوْرَةَ وَ  
الْإِنْجِيلَ وَمَا أُنْزِلَ إِلَيْكُمْ مِنْ رَبِّكُمْ

Say: "O People of the Book! Ye have no ground to stand upon unless ye stand fast by the Law, the Gospel, and all the revelation that has come to you from your Lord."

(Al-Maidah: 68)

الَّذِينَ يَتَّبِعُونَ الرَّسُولَ النَّبِيَّ الْأُمِّيَّ الَّذِي يَجِدُونَهُ مَكْتُوبًا  
عِنْدَهُمْ فِي التَّوْرَةِ وَالْإِنْجِيلِ

"Those who follow the messenger, the unlettered Prophet, whom they find mentioned in their own (scriptures),- in the law and the Gospel (Al-Araf: 157)

This is not only because the Quran presents the same teachings which were presented through the *Toraat* and *Injeel*, but it is unavoidable also because the Quran is the latest—also the last--- edition of the teaching of guidance. Many things which were not there in old editions have been added to it and many of the teachings which were not required now have been omitted. Thus a man who will not accept this new edition will not only disobey Allah but also be deprived of those benefits which have been bestowed upon the man through this last and most modern edition.

يَا أَهْلَ الْكِتَابِ قَدْ جَاءَكُمْ رَسُولُنَا يُبَيِّنُ لَكُمْ كَثِيرًا مِمَّا كُنْتُمْ  
تَخْفُونَ مِنَ الْكِتَابِ وَيَعْفُوا عَنْ كَثِيرٍ ۝

O people of the Book! There hath come to you our Messenger, revealing to you much that ye used to hide in the Book, and passing over much (that is now unnecessary) (Al-Maidah: 15)

وَيُحِلُّ لَهُمُ الطَّيِّبَاتِ وَيُحَرِّمُ عَلَيْهِمُ الْخَبَائِثَ وَيَضَعُ عَنْهُمْ  
إِصْرَهُمْ وَالْأَغْلَالَ الَّتِي كَانَتْ عَلَيْهِمْ ۝

He allows them as lawful what is good (and pure) and prohibits them from what is bad (and impure); He releases them from their heavy burdens and from the yokes that are upon them. (Al-Araf: 157)

It is also necessary that the people of the book altered the previous books advertently and forgot many

things of them. And some of them (like the original revealed *Injeel*) they lost, because of which now it is impossible to follow Moses (AS) and the Torah or Jesus (AS) and *Injeel* without following the Quran.

يُحَرِّفُونَ الْكَلِمَ عَنْ مَوَاضِعِهِ وَنَسُوا حَظًّا مِمَّا ذُكِّرُوا بِهِ

*They change the words from their (right) places and forget a good part of the message that was sent them*

(Al-Maidah: 13)

وَمِنَ الَّذِينَ قَالُوا إِنَّا نَصْرِي أَخَذْنَا مِيثَاقَهُمْ فَنَسُوا حَظًّا مِمَّا

ذُكِّرُوا بِهِ ۝

*From those, too, who call themselves Christians, We did take a covenant, but they forgot a good part of the message that was sent them:*

(Al-Maidah: 14)

Now it is clear that even those nations which were named by the Quran as provided with books have no other way except to obey the Quran. Then how those nations can find the way of guidance without the help of the Quran who are supposed provided books only on the basis of a general principle that every nation has a guide ( لكل قوم ) (هـاد---الرعد: 7).

Apparently it looks very liberal to say that "Islam says not only itself to be true but understands other religions also true. It does not claim that the people will not come on the way of guidance and salvation so long as they do not give up other religions and enter the fold of Islam. Instead it invited to obey the original teachings of their own religions." But, if seen in the light of true reason, it is entirely an irrational claim. A straight line between two points can be only one. Similarly there can be only one straight line between Allah and man. When Islam claims for itself to be the strait path, it necessitates that it should define all other paths as wrong and crooked. It is not the work of a reasonable person to call a path straight and then confirm other paths also as right. If it is

liberalism at all, it is a false and the Quran openly denies such liberalism. The Quran has advised the prophet Muhammad (SAW) to openly announce the following:

وَأَنَّ هَذَا صِرَاطِي مُسْتَقِيمًا فَاتَّبِعُوهُ وَلَا تَتَّبِعُوا السُّبُلَ  
فَتَفَرَّقَ بِكُمْ عَنْ سَبِيلِهِ ذَٰلِكُمْ وَصَّكُمْ بِهِ لَعَلَّكُمْ تَتَّقُونَ ۝

*Verily, this is My way, leading straight: follow it: follow not (other) paths :they will scatter you about from His (great) path: thus doth He command you .That ye may be righteous.* (Al-Anam:153)

The prophet Muhammad (SAW) came to pull the world towards him because he was perfectly assured of being on truth. He was neither in doubt nor (I ask refuge of Allah) was he a flatterer that he would have become ready to keep accord and compromise with the walkers of different paths.

As praiseworthy is liberalism, far more mischievous is the lie. Anybody who wants to demonstrate his liberalism in this matter he can express from his side, but what right does he have to say something with reference to the Quran while it has said nothing of this type? Instead, the Quran says nothing is correct except obeying Muhammad (SAW) and the Quran. Now this is the only way, for ever, of guidance and salvation for the entire world. Result of not obeying it is nothing but straying in the world and destruction in the hereafter:

قُلْ يَٰٓأَيُّهَا النَّاسُ إِنِّي رَسُولُ اللَّهِ إِلَيْكُمْ جَمِيعًا ۝

*Say: "O men! I am sent unto you all, as the Messenger of Allah* (Al-Aaraf: 158)

وَأَوْحَىٰ إِلَيَّ هَٰذَا الْقُرْآنَ لِأُنذِرَكُمْ بِهِ وَمَنْ بَلَغَ ۝

*This Qur'an hath been revealed to me by inspiration, that I may warn you and all whom it reaches.* (Al-Anam: 19)

وَمَا أَرْسَلْنَاكَ إِلَّا كَافَّةً لِّلنَّاسِ بَشِيرًا وَنَذِيرًا ۝

*We have not sent thee but as a universal (Messenger) to men, giving them glad tidings, and warning them (against sin),* (Saba: 28)

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا ادْخُلُوا فِي السِّلْمِ كَآفَّةً وَلَا تَتَّبِعُوا  
خُطَوَاتِ الشَّيْطَانِ ۝

*O ye who believe! Enter into Islam whole-heartedly; and follow not the footsteps of the evil one* (Al-Baqarah: 208)

يَا أَيُّهَا النَّاسُ قَدْ جَاءَكُمْ الرَّسُولُ بِالْحَقِّ مِنْ رَبِّكُمْ فَآمِنُوا  
خَيْرًا لَكُمْ وَإِنْ تَكْفُرُوا فَإِنَّ لِلَّهِ مَا فِي السَّمَوَاتِ وَالْأَرْضِ ۝

*O Mankind! The Messenger hath come to you in truth from Allah: believe in him :It is best for you. But if ye reject Faith, to Allah belong all things in the heavens and on earth:* (Al-Nisa: 170)

وَلَقَدْ أَنْزَلْنَا إِلَيْكَ آيَاتٍ بَيِّنَاتٍ وَمَا يَكْفُرُ بِهَا إِلَّا الْفَاسِقُونَ ۝

*We have sent down to thee Manifest Signs (ayat); and none reject them but those who are perverse* (Al-Baqarah: 99)

وَمَنْ يَكْفُرْ بِهِ فَأُولَٰئِكَ هُمُ الْخَاسِرُونَ ۝

*Those who reject faith therein, - the loss is their own*

(Al-Baqarah: 121)

وَكَذَٰلِكَ أَنْزَلْنَا إِلَيْكَ الْكِتَابَ

*And none but Unbelievers reject our signs* (Al-Ankabut: 47)

فَلْيَحْذَرِ الَّذِينَ يُخَالِفُونَ عَنْ أَمْرٍ أَنْ تُصِيبَهُمْ فِتْنَةٌ أَوْ  
يُصِيبَهُمْ عَذَابٌ أَلِيمٌ ۝

*Then let those beware who withstand the Messenger's order, lest some trial befall them, or a grievous penalty be inflicted on them.* (Al-Noor:63)

وَالَّذِينَ آمَنُوا وَعَمِلُوا الصَّالِحَاتِ وَآمَنُوا بِمَا نُزِّلَ عَلَىٰ  
مُحَمَّدٍ وَهُوَ الْحَقُّ مِنْ رَبِّهِمْ لَا كُفْرَ عَنْهُمْ سَيِّئَاتِهِمْ وَأَصْلَحَ  
بَالَهُمْ ۝ ذَٰلِكَ بِأَنَّ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا اتَّبَعُوا الْبَاطِلَ وَأَنَّ الَّذِينَ  
آمَنُوا اتَّبَعُوا الْحَقَّ مِنْ رَبِّهِمْ ۝

*But those who believe and work deeds of righteousness, and believe in the (Revelation) sent down to Muhammad*

- for it is the Truth from their Lord,- He will remove from them their ills and improve their condition. This because those who reject Allah follow vanities, while those who believe follow the Truth from their Lord: (Muhammad: 2,3)

قَدْ أَنْزَلَ اللَّهُ إِلَيْكُمْ ذِكْرًا ۝ رَسُولًا يَتْلُوا عَلَيْكُمْ آيَاتِ اللَّهِ  
مُتَيِّنَاتٍ لِيُخْرِجَ الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا وَعَمِلُوا الصَّالِحَاتِ مِنَ  
الظُّلُمَاتِ إِلَى النُّورِ ۝

Allah hath indeed sent down to you a Message And Messenger, who rehearses to you the Signs of Allah containing clear explanations, that he may lead forth those who believe and do righteous deeds from the depths of Darkness into Light (At-talaq: 10,11)

قُلْ إِنْ كُنْتُمْ تُحِبُّونَ اللَّهَ فَاتَّبِعُونِي يُحْبِبْكُمُ اللَّهُ ۝

Say: "If ye do love Allah, Follow me: Allah will love you (Al-e-Imran: 31)

فَإِنْ تَوَلَّوْا فَإِنَّ اللَّهَ لَا يُحِبُّ الْكَافِرِينَ ۝

But if they turn back, Allah loves not those who reject Faith (Aal-e-Imran: 32)

The strength found in the words of the above *ayaat* can only be in the language of one who knows that he is perfectly true and on right way, and one who has strong intention of reforming the world according to his knowledge. How those people, who have weak moral strength, have no sure knowledge of truth and are always eager to please everybody, can judge the worth of this language? The most sounding words they can utter are only that, O brothers! You are all good and all true.

**Tarjumanul Quran, Muharram, 1357 A.H.; March, 1938 C.E.**



## **Rational Proof of the Prophecy of Muhammad (SAW)**

Close your eyes for the time being and open the doors of contemplation upon you. Look back to 1400 years of your world. Which type of world it was? How little were means for exchange of thoughts among people? How limited were the modes of relationship among countries and nations. How little informed man was? How narrow were his opinions. How overwhelming his suspicions and wilderness were? How meagre was the light of knowledge in the darkness of ignorance, and with how many obstacles it was expending after pushing into the dark surroundings. There was neither the telegram in the world nor telephone, radio, train or aeroplane. There were neither press nor publishing services. Nor was there ample number of schools and colleges. Neither the news papers and journals were issued nor, the books were written and published in large numbers. Even the scholars of that period had fever knowledge as compared to present common man. A member of higher society of that period was less cultured than a daily wagger of this period. A highly enlightened person of that period was more dark-minded than today's dark-minded man. Things known to everybody today could be known in that period only with difficulty and after a search and labour of years. The information spread today in the surroundings like light are available to every child just as he enters in conscious stage, hundred miles of travel had to be done in that period to achieve such information and even lives were consumed. The beliefs which are supposed as suspicions and qualms today, they were known as truths in that period. The activities considered as indecent and wild

today were ordinary happenings in those days. Methods which the conscience of today's man hates were not only allowed in the morality of the past but nobody could ever think about any possible alternative. Miracles and wonders were so valued that man was not ready to accept truth, respect and holiness of any type so long as it is not supernatural, against habit and extra ordinary. Worst of all, the man considered himself so downgraded that it was far away from his thought that a man can become nearer to God or anybody who is nearer to God can be a man.

In that dark period there was a piece of land where the darkness was even denser. Arab was separate, departed and unique among the countries which were known as civilized according to the then standard of civilization. In countries surrounding it like Iran, Rome and Egypt some light of knowledge, art, decency and culture was found. But big oceans of sand had separated Arab from them. Arab traders went to these countries on camels after travelling for months and came back only after exchange of goods. Light of knowledge and culture did not come with them. There was no school in their country, not a library, no discussion on education among people, no interest in knowledge and arts. There were few countable literate people in whole country, but not efficient and capable of knowledge and art. However, they were equipped with high level and systematic language and had extraordinary capability of expressing lofty thoughts. They also had best literary humour. But the remains of their literature which have reached us tell how limited was their knowledge, how squat were they culturally and in civilization, how overwhelming were their superstitions, how ignorant and wild opinions and habits they had, and how repugnant was their moral outlook?

There was no organized government, no rule, regulation and law, each tribe was autonomous, only the law of jungle was followed. Whoever could overpower the other killed him and captured his property. It was over and above the wisdom of a Bedouin why he should not kill a person who does not belong to his tribe and not become the custodian of his wealth?

Whatever opinions about moral, culture and decency were found among them were very low-graded and greatly unfinished. They were nearly unaware of distinction between pure, impure; allowed, not allowed; and decent and indecent. Their life was very ugly, methods were wild. Adultery, gambling, drinking, theft, robbery murder and bloodshed were their life habits. They were used to undress at common places. Their women used to compass (do طواف of) *Ka'ba* in naked. They buried their living girls so that no one could become their son in law. They married with their step mothers after their fathers' death. They did not know even ordinary norms of taking food, wearing dress and cleaning.

In matters of religion they participated in all those ignorant and stray acts in which world of that period was involved. Worship of idols, spirits, stars; all worships leaving God current in that period were in their habit. They had no correct knowledge about the old messengers and their teachings. They knew only that their forefathers were Abraham and Ismail but not that, what the religion of those father and son was and whom did they worship? Stories of Aad and Thamud were famous among them, but go on reading their stories written by their historians, nowhere you will find the teaching of their prophets Hood and Swaleh. Stories of the prophets of Bani Israel also reached them through Jews and Christians, but to have an idea of these it is enough to have a look at those Israelite

traditions which have been narrated by the Muslim commentators of the Quran. You will know what kind of human being were those prophets who were known to Arabs and the Israelites themselves, and how low-graded was their concept of prophethood?

A man takes birth in such a period and country, and loses the support of his parents and grandfather just in childhood. Therefore, whatever training that child could receive in such a dark environment, he could not receive it. As soon as he becomes conscious of himself he has to graze goats with uncultured boys. He becomes engaged in trade just in youth. All cultural relations, meeting, sitting, talking etc are with the same Arabs whose whereabouts you have learnt just above. No trace of education, even unlettered. No sitting with any scholar as the scholars in Arab were a rarity. Only few time he got chance of taking steps outside the Arab, but only to Syria, and they were too the same kind of trade travels which the trade caravans of Arab used to make in that period. If we suppose that during these travels he could get the chance of observing some signs of knowledge and culture or meeting some knowledgeable persons, it is obvious that the character of man is not made by such casual observations and occasional meetings. They do not so greatly influence the personality of a man that he may become quite separate, different and so high from his environment that no relation to his environment could be seen in him. It is not possible to get such knowledge from these assorted sources that may make an unlettered villager, the leader, not of a country but the entire world, not of a period but of all times. Had he consulted outer sources to any extent, there was actually no source throughout the world, nobody in the world knew about the concepts and principles of religion, moral, culture and

civilization, they were not present anywhere in the world, nowhere in the world, the models of human character were available, they could not be learnt anywhere.

Not only Arab but keep an eye on the environment of the whole world. Among those this person took birth, passed his childhood, with them he was reared and became young, lived with and dealt with them, he was quite different from them in habits and moral, he never speaks lie, the whole nation gives witness on his truthfulness. His strongest enemy did not blame him that he spoke lie on that occasion. He never uses foul language with anybody. Nobody listened from him any abuse or shameful talk. He deals many people but never speaks sour and disgusting language. Instead of being harsh his language is sweet so that everybody is attracted to him. He never does bad dealing, never slays others rights. Never takes a penny without right though he has been engaged in trade for a long time. People who deal with him always trust his piety. Whole nation calls him trustworthy. Even his enemies keep their precious things with him and he protects them. He is such a shameful person among shameless people that nobody could see him naked. He is such a good mannered person among ill mannered people that he never involves in immoral acts; touches not wine and keeps away from gambling. He is such a decent person among indecent people that he hates all kinds of filth and all his works are pure and clean. Among pitiless persons he has such a pity heart that keeps sympathy with all injured and painful people; helps orphans and widows, feed travellers, nobody gets pain from him and he takes pain for others. Among wild people he is such a peace liking man that he feels pain on fighting and blood-shed in his nation, keeps away from fighting and always ahead in making peace treaty between fighting

groups. Among idol worshippers he is such a person of right nature and sound intellect that he finds nothing in between sky and the earth capable of worship, his head bows not before any creature, he does not accept to eat the food presented to idols, his heart hates from within the paganism and worshipping creatures.

In this environment he is as prominent as a lamp is glowing in deep and dense darkness or there is a shining diamond in a heap of stones.

After passing this clean pure noble life for about 40 years there begins a revolution in his life. He is agitated by the darkness which is surrounding him. He wants to get out of the dangerous ocean of ignorance, immorality, characterless environment, disorder, paganism and idol worship. He was able to see nothing according to his nature in this environment. He begins to sit aloof from everything, away from the dwellings in loneliness of mountains and lives in the company of calm and quite hills for some days. Purifies more and more his soul, heart and mind by fasting. He thinks meditates in search of a light that he may use to clear darkness of all around. He seeks for strength to better reorganise the disturbed world.

All of a sudden a grand change appears in his life; a light appears in his heart he never observed before. A power fills in him from which he was devoid of till now. He comes out of the loneliness of cave, goes to his people and says these idols you have been worshipping are unreal, leave them. No tree, no stone, spirit or planet is respectable so that you bow your head before, obey, worship or follow. This earth, moon, sun, stars, all things in between the earth and sky, are the creations of One God. Only He is your creator and the creator of all things, only He kills and gives life. Worship him alone, obey Him and bow your head only before him. Theft, raids, killing,

cruelty and bad deeds you are involved in are sin. Give up all these, Allah does not like them, speak truth, keep justice, neither kill anybody nor snatch other's things. Take everything rightfully and also give rightfully. You are all human being who are equal. Neither anybody has taken birth in disrespect nor with the throne of grace. Greatness, respect and grace is not in the tribe and race, it is there only in God's worship virtuous deeds and piety. One who fears God, who is pious and clean is the man of higher status, otherwise he is nothing and valueless. You have to stand after death before your Lord. Every one of you is accountable for your actions before God, Who looks and knows all things. You cannot hide anything from him. The worksheet of your life will be presented to him complete and He will decide your fate on that basis. No recommendation or bribe will work before that true justice nor will the lineage be asked. Only faith and good deeds will have weight there. One who will have these goods will get entry to paradise and the one having none of them will be pushed into hell.

This was the message with which he came out of the cave.

Ill-bred nation becomes his enemy, abuses and stones him. Not for one or two days but for complete thirteen years she remains harsh, cruel and unjust and finally thrashes him out of the city. Even after that she does not sit quiet but teases him at his new abode. Motivates entire Arab against him and fights for eight years complete. He tolerates all these hurts but does not give up his move.

Why his nation became his enemy? Was it a case of wealth and property, any claim of murder? Was he begging something of the world? No, the only cause of enmity was, why does he teach us worship of only one

God, piety and virtuous acts? Why does he speak against idol worship and other vices, why he endangers the leadership of priests, why breaks the magical network of leadership, why he tries to finish the distinction of ranks between man and man, why he defines as ignorance the enmity between sects and cults, why he wants to shatter the ancient system of the society? The nation says to him whatever you are saying is against the family traditions and the way of the nation, give it up otherwise we shall make your life troublesome.

Why this person took these troubles on his shoulder? The nation was ready to make him king, present him heaps of wealth if he gives up his teachings. But he kicked them all and accepted stones and all types of tyrannies for the sake of his teachings. Why this after all? Was there any benefit to his self in their becoming good? Was there a benefit compared to which all attractions of state, kingdom, wealth and comfort lost influence? Was there a benefit for which a man could tolerate for complete 21 years hardest physical and spiritual tortures? Contemplate! Can you think of any model of piety, sacrifice and sympathy of human being higher than this; that a man should take on his shoulder all pains not for his but for others benefit? Those for whose good he works hard shower stones over him, abuse, exile him and even in this condition do not leave him and yet he does not leave doing well for them.

Then look! Can a man take these troubles for baseless things? Can a person working on opinions and guess so strongly stand on his words? Mountains of calamities dropped over him, the earth was narrowed for him, entire country stood against, armies rushed on him but he did not agree to recede from his position equal to a point. This residence, determination, resoluteness is



witness to the fact that he was perfectly sure of his truthfulness. He could not have stayed to confront the storms of calamities for consecutive 21 years if he had a little tint of doubt in his mission.

This was one aspect of change that occurred in that great person. The other aspect is even more wonderful. He was an Arab among other Arabs up to the age of forty. During this period nobody knew this trader as an orator and a magical speaker. Nobody heard him talking so wisely. None of the Arabs saw him discussing the problems of metaphysics, moral philosophy, law, politics, economics and sociology. Nobody could hear him talking on the topics of God, angels, heavenly books, past messengers, ancient nations, dooms day, resurrection, hell and paradise. Surly he was adorned with holy morals, sincere ways and best character, but no such extraordinary thing was found in him up to the age of 40 years that people could expect that he would become an extraordinary person. People knew him only as a quiet, peaceful and perfectly noble man. But after 40 years when he came out the cave with a new message he was totally changed.

Now he was presenting a wonderful message so that the entire Arab awed and stunted. The words were so effective that his harsh enemies too feared listening to him lest his speech settle in hearts. Eloquence, persuasiveness and strength of his speech challenged the entire Arab nation which included great poets, orators and claimants of eloquence. It challenged again and again to come forward and present even a *surah* (chapter) like it, but no one could dare to accept the challenge. The Arabs did not hear such dialogue before.

Now he appeared as a wise without example, a unique reformer of moral and civilization, a wonderful

expert of politics, a great lawyer, a grand justice and a unique soldier. Now this desert dweller, unlettered person started saying such things full of wisdom and intellect which never said before and none could say afterwards. That unlettered person began delivering decisive speeches on grand problems of metaphysics, giving lectures on the philosophy of growth and downfall of nations through the mirror of history. He began to review the achievements of old reformers, criticise the world religions and give judgments on differences between nations; began to teach lessons of moral, culture and etiquettes.

He started framing laws about sociology, economics, collective and international matters; the laws whose wisdom can be understood but with difficulty by scholars and intellectuals even after deep contemplation and long life experience. And their wisdom goes on expending more and more with the increasing experience of the world.

That quiet peaceful trader who never used the sword, got army training, so far so that throughout his life he participated in only one battle that too as an observer, all of a sudden became such a brave warrior who did not retreat even an inch before most difficult wars. He became such a great General who won over entire Arab within a short period of 9 years. He became such a tremendous military guide of that, influenced by his army system and war spirit, the armless Arabs turned upside down the two grand powers of the world within few years.

That lonely and peace loving person in whom nobody could even smell political interest for 40 years appeared all of a sudden as such a great reformer and councillor that he made within 23 years the divided, fighting, ignorant, mutinous, uncultured and infighting tribes of desert expended over 12 *lakh* square miles,

obedient of a religion, culture, law and system of government without the help of train, telegram, radio and press. He changed their views, norms and morals. He turned their impolite into high levelled etiquette; wildness into civility; characterless and immoral nature into virtue, piety and moral; and rebel and anarchy into perfect loyalty and obedience. He made the infertile nation, which could not produce any notable person for centuries, as fertile as to produce thousand after thousand great men of acumen, who spread throughout the world to teach lessons of moral and culture.

And he did not accomplish this work through tyranny, harshness, deception and trickery, but through heart charming moral, soul capturing nobility and mind arresting teaching. Through moral, he converted enemies into friends, softened hearts through mercy and love, governed with fairness and justice and never deviated least from truth. He did not break promise or deceit even during war. He was not cruel even to his enemies; those who were thirsty of his blood, showered stones on him, expelled him from his homeland, collected entire Arab against him, chewed the liver of his uncle out of enmity, he forgave them also after winning over them. He never took revenge for his self.

Together with all these things his level of selflessness was so high that after he became sovereign in land he remained as poorly as before; lived in the hut of thatch, slept on canvas, coarsely dressed and ate like poor persons. Stood for long times in prayer before his Master with empty stomach, served the poor and those who were found in difficulty, he did not hesitate working even as a labourer. He had not a tint of kingly grandeur, rich men's majesty, and great men's pride till his last breath. He met people like ordinary man, participated in their difficulties

and pains, and use to sit among people in such a way that recognition in any sitting between the people and the commander of nation and the king of the country was difficult. Despite being such a great man he treated lowest of the low in such a way as if he is one of them. He saved nothing for himself during the hard labour of entire life; left everything in the name of his nation. He did not establish his and his children's rights on his disciples. So far so that he rejected the right of accepting alms to his children lest in the long run the people should begin to expend all alms on them.

The list of perfections of this grand personality is not complete so far. You should have an overall study of the world history to assess his status correctly. You will see that this unlettered dweller of Arabian Desert, who used to sit on mat and who took birth in the dark period of 1400 years before, was in fact the founder of modern age and leader of the whole world. He is the leader of those who are faithful to him and also of those who are not. They do not have even the sense of the fact how the guidance of the person they speak against has made its way to their thoughts, principles of life, rules of actions and has settled in the spirit of modern age.

This is the same person who turned the direction of world opinions from suspicions, wonders and monasticism towards rationalism, reality and pious worldly engagements. He developed attraction towards understanding intellectual miracles and considering them the standard of truth in the world which was used to demanding sensual miracles. He opened the eyes of those who were used to search the signs of God in miraculous things, and developed in them the habit of searching His signs in natural phenomena. He was the one who brought speculative opinion seekers to the track of intellection,

ratiocination, observation and research. Only he told the man the distinctive limits of intellect, sense and intuition. He developed relationship between material and spiritual aspects of life. He created contact of knowledge and action with religion and that of religion with knowledge and action. He developed scientific spirit in the world by using the power of religion and gave true religious tilt through scientific spirit. He uprooted partnership to God and creature worship, and established the Doctrine of Unity (*Tawhid*) so strongly through the power of knowledge that even the religions of pagans and idol worshippers felt bound to take the colour of unity. He was the one to change the basic concepts of moral and spiritualism. Those who considered seclusion from the world and mortification of self the basics of morality, those for whom the spiritual growth and salvation was not possible together with accomplishing the rights of body and psyche and participating in the matters of worldly life, he showed them the way of moral growth, spiritual evolution and salvation. Moreover he is the same person who told man his true value and status. Those who were not ready to accept as guide other than *bhagwan*, incarnation, and the son of God, he taught them the lesson that a person like you can be the representative of Heavenly kingdom and Caliph of the Master of world. Those who considered every powerful man a god, only he taught them that man is nothing except man; neither anybody has come here with the birth right of holiness, governance and command, nor anybody has taken birth with the stain of dirtiness, toil and slavery. It was his teaching that sowed the seeds of human unity, equity, democracy and freedom.

Go ahead of concepts; you will find the practical effects of his leadership in the laws, ways and matters of

today's world in numbers difficult to count. Innumerable principles of moral, culture, etiquettes, purity and cleanliness are the extracts of his teachings spread over the world. How much the world has made use of those rules and still using them which he developed for social life? How many movements began and are still coming into motion as a result of those economic principles which he taught? How many revolutions occurred and are occurring in political ideas of the world after observing the benefits of his ways of governance? How deeply the principles of justice and law enforced by him influenced and are still very quietly influencing the world judicial system and viewpoints of law? Rules of war and peace and the culture of international relations practically established by the person was in fact this unlettered Arab. Otherwise before it the world did not know that there can be a culture for war also and that it is possible to settle matters on common bases of humanity.

On the canvas of human history the grand personality of this wonderful man is so highly prominent that the greatest men from beginning to date who are considered as heroes look dwarf before him. None of the world heroes could shine in perfection beyond one or two compartments of human life. Someone is the king of theories but nil in practical power. The other has the potential of action but is weak in thought. Someone's perfection is limited to political devices while another has only army talent. A man's sight is as deeply focused on collective life as to hide other aspects. A man concentrated on moral and spiritual aspects and forgot the economic and political side; the other person took economy and politics and left moral and spirituality. Thus we find in history only one sided heroes. Only in this personality all perfections are together. He is a

philosopher and wise in himself and also the establisher of his philosophy in practical life. He is a political councillor as well as an army commander, law maker, moral teacher, religious and spiritual leader as well. His sight expands all over human life and goes deep into little details. From the rules of eating and drinking, cleanliness of body to international relations he gives guidance and commands and establishes a permanent civilization according to his viewpoint and develops such equilibrium that no sign of imbalance is seen. Do you have in your sight any other person with this perfection?

None of the great historical personalities of the world has been uninfluenced by his whereabouts; everyone is little or more the product of his environment. But this man is uniquely glorious. No participation of environment is seen in his making. Nor can it be proved by any evidence that the environment of Arab at that time was historically demanding the birth of a person who should have made a nation by finishing the differences of tribes, and conquering over the Arabs, should have made arrangements for their economic growth and development. The environment of Arab land could have given way only to a nationalist leader having all the attributes of the then Arabs who by all means of tyranny, unkindness, bloodshed, fraud, deception and by using every possible device would have made Arabs prosperous and establish a kingdom of similar attributes to leave for the coming generations. You can prove no consequence of Arab history other than this. From Hegel's philosophy or Marxist material viewpoint of history you can say as much as, that at that time and in that environment there should have or could have appeared a maker of a nation and a kingdom. But how the Hegelian or Marxist philosophy would explain the fact that at that time and in

such an environment quite a different person appeared who was the teacher of best moral, maker of humanity, cleaner of hearts and eraser of all suspicions and bigotries of ignorant period, whose sight spread all over humanity by demolishing the boundaries of race and countries. It was he who laid the foundation of moral, spiritual, cultural and political system not for his nation but for the entire humanity. He established economic matters, politics, civilization and international relations not in ideas, but in the real world on moral basis and combined the spiritual and material with balance, which is a grand model of intellect and wisdom today as it was in the past. Can you claim about such a person that he was the product of the ignorance of Arab environment?

Not only that he does not seem to be the product of his environment, but when we look at his achievements we find that he was free from the limits of time and space; his sight penetrates the screens of centuries and millenniums and goes beyond. He looks at man through every period and environment and provides such moral and practical guidelines which correctly fit to every condition. He does not belong to those who become old with history; those whom we can praise only as that they were good leaders of their period. Unique and distinct from all, he is a leader marching ahead with history and seems as modern in every period as he was in the preceding period.

The people whom you call the makers of history are in fact the creatures of history. In fact the history maker throughout human history is only this man; go through, with investigative curiosity, the life of those leaders who have caused revolutions in the world. You will find that on such occasions the causes of revolution were already present and also giving direction to the revolution they



were to cause. The revolutionary leader only participated as an actor to bring the potential into action for which the stage and the action were already fixed. But in the entire group of history makers or revolutionaries, this is the only person who created causes where the causes of revolution were not present, where there was no material for revolution, he created it, where the spirit and ability of revolution was absent, he himself created such people. He melted his own personality and imbibed it into the heart of thousands and made them as he wanted to see them, his energy and power of intention created the environment of revolution and fixed its structure, nature and direction. He by using his own power of intention turned the speed of time situations and took them to the way he wanted to bring them. Where else you will find the history maker of this grandeur and the revolutionary of this splendour?

Now we should think on an important question. What was the source of such a great and fine knowledge, light, power, perfections, highly guided energies which appeared all of a sudden in the dark world of 1400 years before, in a corner of darkest country of Arab and in a shepherd, trader, unlettered, desert dweller? You claim that it was all the creation of his mind. I say that if it was the creation of his mind he should claimed for godhood. Had he done it then the world which made god Rama, Krishna, Buddha, which considered by its own will the Messiah as the son of God, which worshipped even fire, water and air could never refuse to accept as God a person of this perfection and grandeur. But look! What he says. He does not take the credit of his own perfections and says: I am a human being, a man like you. I have nothing of my own. Everything belongs to God and is from Him. These words (The Quran), the like of which the entire humanity cannot produce is not mine, not the result of my

intelligence, its every word is from God and its praise goes to God alone. These achievements which I have shown, the laws that I framed, the rules that I taught you, none of them is my composition. I have no power of presenting anything out of my own ability, but depend upon God's guidance for everything. I do and say only that which comes from Him.

Look! What a wonderful truth is this? What a high level trustworthiness and truthfulness. A liar does not hesitate to take the credit of even those works of others, the actual source of which soon comes into everyman's knowledge. But this man does not relate even those perfections to himself for which if he had said his own, then nobody could have falsified him because none of them was having any way for reaching that original source. What else can be the evidence of being true as clear as this? Who else can be truer than a person who keeps the most secret and subtle source of unique and exemplary achievements, even then he tells without hesitation about his real source? Tell, why should we not testify him?

**Tarjumanul Quran: Shawwal, 1355 A.H; January, 1937 C.E.**

## Following and Obedience of the Prophet

(This essay was written in criticism of Maulana Hafiz Mohd. Aslam Jairajpuri's book, "*Ta'limaat-e-Quran*" (Teachings of the Quran).

Opinions expressed by the writer of the book, "*Ta'limaat-e-Quran*" during explaining the prophet hood and its orders are not befitting in my view to the concept of prophet hood presented by the Quran. The learned writer has written of page 59 as follows:

"The law in principle is only the Book of Allah

اتَّبِعُوا مَا أُنْزِلَ إِلَيْكُمْ مِنْ رَبِّكُمْ وَلَا تَتَّبِعُوا مِنْ دُونِهِ أَوْلِيَاءَ

*Follow (O men!) the revelation given unto you from your Lord, and follow not, as friends or protectors, other than Him. Little it is ye remember of admonition. (Al-Araf:3)*

وَأَمْرُهُمْ شُورَى بَيْنَهُمْ -

*who (conduct) their affairs by mutual Consultation*

(Al-Shura: 38)

The writer has omitted the model of the prophet. His proposal is that the Muslims should frame detailed laws with mutual consultation after taking principles from the noble Quran. But between these two links there was another link also which Allah Himself fixed within the chain. That link is:

قُلْ إِنْ كُنْتُمْ تُحِبُّونَ اللَّهَ فَاتَّبِعُونِي يُحْبِبْكُمُ اللَّهُ

*Say: "If ye do love Allah, Follow me: Allah will love you*

(Aal-e-Imran: 31)

No doubt that basic law is the Qurani but it has not been sent to us directly; it has come through the prophet of Allah. And the prophet has been made the medium so that he may apply this basic law in the active life of the *ummat* and present a model, and by using his God given

insight he may set for us methods according to which we should apply this basic law in our collective life and individual behavior. Thus according to the Quran correct order is – first God's sent law, then the method of the prophet and then the inference (اجتهاد), in the light of both, of those who have been charged with authority.

أَطِيعُوا اللَّهَ وَأَطِيعُوا الرَّسُولَ وَأُولَى الْأَمْرِ مِنْكُمْ فَإِنْ تَنَازَعْتُمْ فِي شَيْءٍ فَرُدُّوهُ إِلَى اللَّهِ وَالرَّسُولِ ۝

*O ye who believe! Obey Allah, and obey the Messenger, and those charged with authority among you. If ye differ in anything among yourselves, refer it to Allah and His Messenger,* (Al-Nisa: 59)

The phrase is especially to concentrate upon. Whenever there is difference of opinion among Muslims in problems of *Shari'ah*, they have been ordered to refer back to Allah and the prophet (SAW). If the source was only the Noble Quran, then the phrase "refer it to Allah" would have been enough. But here "and the prophet" has also been said, which clearly tell that the prophet is also a source after Allah.

After this the writer has quoted following *ayaat* of the Quran:

مَا عَلَى الرَّسُولِ إِلَّا الْبَلَاغُ

*The Messenger's duty is but to proclaim the message* (Al-Maidah: 99)

وَمَا عَلَيْنَا إِلَّا الْبَلَاغُ الْمُبِينُ

*And our duty is only to proclaim the clear Message.* (Yaseen: 17)

Then he claims that the duty of the office of prophethood is no more than to proclaim the message of Allah (page 55).

إِنْ عَلَيْكَ إِلَّا الْبَلَاغُ

*Thy duty is but to convey the Message (Al-Shoora: 48)*

فَإِنْ تَوَلَّيْتُمْ فَإِنَّمَا عَلَى رَسُولِنَا الْبَلَاغُ الْمُبِينُ

*But if ye turn back, the duty of Our Messenger is but to proclaim the Message clearly and openly.*

*(At-Taghabun:12)*

فَإِنَّمَا عَلَيْكَ الْبَلَاغُ وَعَلَيْنَا الْحِسَابُ

*Thy duty is to make (the Message) reach them: it is our part to call them to account. (Ar-Ra'd:40)*

Herein the writer has projected the status of the prophet (SAW) --- through oversight of the context and objective of words --- as if he was simply an informer or (God save us) a postman. But if he had read these sentences together with the whereabouts of the text he would have known that they are not directed towards the believers of the prophet but his rejecters are their addressees. Those who rejected the prophet again and again have been told that the duty of the prophet is to convey our teachings to you, and that he has done. Now you cannot say that no guide was sent to us.

مَا جَاءَنَا مِنْ بَشِيرٍ وَلَا نَذِيرٍ

*There came unto us no bringer of glad tidings and no Warner from evil. (Al-Maidah: 19)*

Now you have no argument against God:

لِنَلَّا يَكُونَ لِلنَّاسِ عَلَى اللَّهِ حُجَّةٌ بَعْدَ الرُّسُلِ

*that mankind, after (the coming) of the messengers, should have no plea against Allah: (Al-Nisa: 165)*

Now you will harm yourself if not accepted:

فَمَنْ كَفَرَ بَعْدَ ذَلِكَ مِنْكُمْ فَقَدْ ضَلَّ سَوَاءَ السَّبِيلِ

*but if any of you, after this, resisteth faith, he hath truly wandered from the path or rectitude. (Al-Maidah: 12)*

The prophet (SAW) has also been said in this connection, why do you suffer at heart if these infidels

flee? You have not been made their superintendent. Your responsibility is only to present right path before them, and that you have done. As for the question whether they come to this path or not, is not your responsibility. Your duty is not to bring them to this path by force. You are not accountable if they flee from your teaching and preaching and walk on crooked ways.

فَإِنْ أَعْرَضُوا فَمَا أَرْسَلْنَاكَ عَلَيْهِمْ حَفِظًا. إِنْ عَلَيْكَ إِلَّا  
الْبَلَاغُ ○

*If then they run away, We have not sent thee as a guard over them. Thy duty is but to convey (the Message).*

(Al-Shoora:48)

فَذَكِّرْ إِنَّمَا أَنْتَ مُذَكِّرٌ لَسْتَ عَلَيْهِمْ بِمُصَيِّرٍ ○

*Therefore do thou give admonition, for thou art one to admonish. Thou art not one to manage (men's) affairs.*

(Al-Ghasia: 21, 22)

This is all about the infidels. As for those who accept Islam and become the member of Muslim *Ummah* the position of the prophet is not simply that of an informer but for them he is a teacher, trainer (مربي), model of Islamic life, and such a commander whose command should be followed without ifs and buts in all periods. His responsibility as a prophet is to teach Allah's commandments and explain His laws.

وَيُعَلِّمُهُمُ الْكِتَابَ وَالْحِكْمَةَ

*and instruct them in scripture and wisdom*

(Al-Baqarah: 129)

In the capacity of a trainer (مربي) his responsibility is to train Muslims according to the teachings and the laws of the Quran and according to the same frame mold their life and garnish (ويزكّهم) them. Being a model means that he should present himself as the practical model of the teachings of the Quran his life should be just an image of a Muslim according to the objectives of the Quran. It

should be known to everyone through his words and actions how the tongue should be used, strengths should be utilized, which behaviour is according to the objectives of the book of Allah and whatever is against it is in fact against the book.

لَقَدْ كَانَ لَكُمْ فِي رَسُولِ اللَّهِ أُسْوَةٌ حَسَنَةٌ

*Ye have indeed in the Messenger of Allah a beautiful pattern of conduct* (Al-Ahzab: 21)

وَمَا يَنْطِقُ عَنِ الْهَوَىٰ إِنْ هُوَ إِلَّا وَحْيٌ يُوحَىٰ

*Nor does he say (aught) of (his own) Desire. It is no less than inspiration sent down to him* (Al-Najm: 3, 4)

The prophet (SAW) is also the commander (امير) of Muslims. Not that type of commander whom one may differ from, but whose command has to be obeyed without ifs and buts just as the *ayaat* of the Quran are to be obeyed.

فَإِنْ تَنَازَعْتُمْ فِي شَيْءٍ فَرُدُّوهُ إِلَى اللَّهِ وَالرَّسُولِ

*If ye differ in anything among yourselves, refer it to Allah and His Messenger* (Al-Nisa: 59)

مَنْ يُطِيعِ الرَّسُولَ فَقَدْ أَطَاعَ اللَّهَ

*He who obeys the Messenger, obeys Allah* (Al-Nisa: 80)

He was a commander not only in his life span but also the commander of all Muslims till dooms day, whose orders a Muslim has to refer to in all periods and conditions because none of the *ayaat* presented above are conditioned by period or time.

The writer has committed three great mistakes in understanding the status of prophet hood

1. First is that he has confined the responsibility in the prophet only to deliver message (نامه بری), even though the position of the prophet as conveyer of the message is only so far as people have not entered the fold of Islam and only for those who have not accepted his

invitation till now. As for those who have become the members of Muslim *Ummah* he is not their preacher alone, but he is the leader, commander, lawyer, teacher, trainer and model that has to be imitated.

2. The second mistake of the writer is the consequence of the first. When he considered prophet as only a preacher for all Muslims and non Muslims he faced the problem of how to interpret the *ayaat* which call the prophet as a teacher, trainer and model? Consequently he merged all these responsibilities of the prophet in preaching and inferred that all other aspects of prophet's life are personal. Thus he writes that "the meaning of the *ayah*

وَمَا يَنْطِقُ عَنِ الْهَوَىٰ ۖ إِنْ هُوَ إِلَّا وَحْيٌ يُوحَىٰ

*Nor does he say aught of his own Desire. It is no less than inspiration sent down to him* (Al-Najm: 3, 4)

that whatever Muhammad (SAW) said was revelation is not correct, because the claim was that the Quran is a revealed book which the infidels refuted. Only about it was said, "Whatever he speaks is revelation". What he talked within home with his holy wives or outside with other people was neither claimed to be revelation nor was there any argument on it among the infidels."

When we study this explanation in combination with other claims like "The work of the prophet is to convey the message of God only", "obedience of the prophet means to act according to the message of God he has brought" and that, "Our prophet was only the preacher of the Quran". It all means to differentiate between Muhammad (SAW), the son of Abdullah as a prophet and Muhammad (SAW), the son of Abdullah as a man. Whatever he teaches about the Quran and orders us according to the Quran in the capacity of a prophet have to be listened to and obeyed. However, his words and



actions as a man are like the words and actions of other human being. Their being revealed from God and pure from mistake and misguidance is not fit in the opinion of the writer, nor does he find in them any model to imitate.

But the distinction he has made between Muhammad, the son of Abdullah as a man and Muhammad, the prophet of Allah as a preacher is never proven from the Quran. The Quran had described only one capacity of him, that is his capacity of messenger or prophet.<sup>1</sup> From the time Allah *ta'ala* bestowed upon him the responsibility of a prophet till last breath of his material life he was prophet at each moment and in all situations. Each word and action of him was in the capacity of Allah's prophet. He was a preacher (مبلغ) and teacher (معلم) in the same capacity, also the trainer (مربي) and purifier (مزكى), judge (قاضى) and ruler (حاكم), leader (امام) and commander (امير). Not only this but all matters of his personal, familial and civilizational life were under this large umbrella and his noble life in all these aspects was such a model of perfect man, sincere Muslim and true Believer which Allah *ta'ala* declared to be the best model to imitate for a man who is eager to please Allah and gain success in the hereafter.

لَقَدْ كَانَ لَكُمْ فِي رَسُولِ اللَّهِ أُسْوَةٌ حَسَنَةٌ

*Ye have indeed in the Messenger of Allah a beautiful pattern (of conduct) for any one whose hope is in Allah and the Final Day* (Al-Ahzab: 21)

There is no subtlest hint in the Quran indicating distinction in the prophet hood, manhood and being a commander. And how this distinction could be made?

---

<sup>1</sup> One can doubt that this is against what we have said before under the title "Islamic Concept of Freedom". But this doubt will be solved if the title is read thoughtfully.

When he was a prophet of God his entire life must have been within the limits of *shari'ah* and representing it and no action, no movement must be against the pleasure of Allah. The same fact has been told in first few *ayaat* of *surah al-Najm*.

مَا ضَلَّ صَاحِبُكُمْ وَمَا غَوَىٰ

*Your Companion is neither astray nor being misled*

وَمَا يَنْطِقُ عَنِ الْهَوَىٰ

*Nor does he say (aught) of (his own) Desire*

إِنْ هُوَ إِلَّا وَحْيٌ يُوحَىٰ-

*It is no less than inspiration sent down to him*

عَلَّمَهُ شَدِيدُ الْقُوَىٰ-

*He was taught by one Mighty in Power,*

Such a teacher has taught him whose powers are great. The writer say that here the claim is that the Quran is a revealed book. But I do not see tinniest hint towards the Quran in these *ayaat*. The pronoun (هُوَ) in the *ayah* (إِنْ هُوَ إِلَّا وَحْيٌ يُوحَىٰ) points to the speech of the prophet which is referred to in the *ayah* (وَمَا يَنْطِقُ عَنِ الْهَوَىٰ). There is nothing in these *ayaat* on the basis of which the speech of the prophet may be defined as the Quran. Everything on which the word speech of the prophet may apply will be revelation on the basis of this *ayah* and will be pure of lust. This has been clarified in the Quran because the people to whom the prophet was sent should be perfectly satisfied with his being protected from mistake, misguidance and lust and they should know that prophet's everything is from God. If as against it doubt appears in any thing of the prophet that it is not from God and is the outcome of lust the confidence in his prophet hood will be lost. Infidels rejected the same. They --- God save us --- understood that he is lunatic, or some man teaches him, or he says out of his heart. Allah *ta'ala* corrected this view through revelation and said in clear words that your

companion has not lost the way, he is not misguided, also does not say anything out of lust. Each word coming out of his tongue is truth from Our side; any man, jinn or devil does not teach him but his teacher is strong and powerful. The prophet (SAW) himself said similar words while pointing towards his tongue.

فَوَالَّذِي نَفْسِي بِيَدِهِ مَا يَخْرُجُ مِنْهُ إِلَّا حَقًّا.

*I swear by Him in Whose possession is my self whatever comes out of it is always truth.*

Alas! The author of the "*Ta'limaat -e- Quran*" dissents from it. He says: "whatever the prophet talked in his home with noble wives or other persons outside home was not claimed to be revelation, nor infidels had argument about it". I say whatever His Majesty did any time in any condition he did as a prophet". All was pure from misguidance, forgetfulness and lust. The sound nature that Allah *ta'ala* provided him, and the limits of piety and purity which He taught him, all his words and actions were produced by the same nature and limited from the same boundaries. He was a model for imitation by the entire humanity and only from him we can know, what is allowed and what is prohibited, what is *haram* and what is *halal*, what pleases God and what makes him angry, in which issue we are free to opine and in what not, how should we follow the command, how to make decisions through mutual discussion (شورى) and what means democracy in our religion.

3. Third great mistake of the author is that he has separated the capacity of commander from the capacity of prophet hood of the messenger (SAW) which has no proof in the Quran. He writes:

There are two types of differences between obedience in the capacity of prophet and the capacity of the commander.

(a) In the capacity of prophet the messenger was not bound to seek opinion of others. Propagation of Islam was made by Allah his obligatory duty.

يَا أَيُّهَا الرُّسُولُ بَلِّغْ مَا أُنْزِلَ إِلَيْكَ مِنْ رَبِّكَ وَإِنْ لَمْ تَفْعَلْ  
فَمَا بَلَّغْتَ رِسَالَتَهُ

*O Messenger! Proclaim the (message) which hath been sent to thee from thy Lord. If thou didst not, thou wouldst not have fulfilled and proclaimed His mission.*

(Al-Maidah:67)

But he has been ordered to seek others opinion in the capacity of a commander (وَ شَاوَرْتُمْ فِي الْأَمْرِ). And keep them with you in day to seek their opinion (3: 159).

(b) In the capacity of prophet his obedience is compulsory till the Last Day because the Quran is forever. But his obedience as commander was only before him (بِالْمُشَافَه).

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا أَطِيعُوا اللَّهَ وَرَسُولَهُ وَلَا تَوَلَّوْا عَنْهُ وَأَنْتُمْ  
تَسْمَعُونَ

*O ye who believe! Obey Allah and His Messenger, and turn not away from him when ye hear (him speak).*

(Al-Anfal:20)

Duties related to commander will always be emergent because environment also changes with time. Obviously today's commander will not use spear and sword to imitate the Battle of Badr and Uhod but will make use of modern weapons. Moreover, one has a right to differ from a commander.

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا أَطِيعُوا اللَّهَ وَأَطِيعُوا الرُّسُولَ وَأُولِي الْأَمْرِ  
مِنْكُمْ فَإِنْ تَنَازَعْتُمْ فِي شَيْءٍ فَرُدُّوهُ إِلَى اللَّهِ وَالرُّسُولِ

*O ye who believe! Obey Allah, and obey the Messenger, and those charged with authority among you. If ye differ in anything among yourselves, refer it to Allah and His Messenger*

(Al-Nisa: 59)

This is all the result of understanding the intention (منشأ) of the Quran. The author did not consider that *Rasulullah* (SAW) was not made commander by people. He also did not declare by himself to be so. He was made commander by Allah. His command was not discrete from his prophet hood. In fact he was commander in the capacity of prophet. More correct is that he was not a commander but commanded by Allah. The author could not understand this truth, and considered the capacity of his command like the capacity of ordinary commanders.

Also, he has wrongly understood those *ayaat* of the Quran which he has used as evidences in his favour. No doubt, *Rasulullah* (SAW) ordered to seek opinion of his companions, but it was to present a model of opinion seeking and guide to correct principles of democracy. It is not correct to derive from this that his position is like other commanders. For others the rule is that they should work with mutual understanding and if there is difference of opinion they should refer back to Allah and his messenger.

وَأَمْرُهُمْ شُورَى بَيْنَهُمْ

*who (conduct) their affairs by mutual Consultation*

(Al-Shoora: 38)

فَإِنْ تَنَازَعْتُمْ فِي شَيْءٍ فَرُدُّوهُ إِلَى اللَّهِ وَالرَّسُولِ

*If ye differ in anything among yourselves, refer it to Allah and His Messenger*

(Al-Nisa: 59)

But when *Rasulullah* (SAW) has been ordered to seek opinion he has also been advised that when you are firm in decision you take step keeping confidence in God.

فَإِذَا عَزَمْتَ فَتَوَكَّلْ عَلَى اللَّهِ

*Then, when thou hast taken a decision put thy trust in Allah*

(Aal-e-Imran: 159)

It shows that he was not bound to seek opinion but he was ordered to ask for others views so that correct democratic government may come into existence by his own noble hands.

As for the opinion of the author that the prophet's following as commander was limited to his period is also wrong. And the *ayah* on which his evidence is based does not give this meaning. The author has derived from (وَ أَتَمُّ) (تَسْمَعُونَ --- الانفال: 28) that this order was given to those who were listening to this order at that time. Had he recited the *surah* from the beginning he would have known that the aim of that is quite different. It has been said in the beginning that:

أَطِيعُوا اللَّهَ وَرَسُولَهُ إِن كُنْتُمْ مُؤْمِنِينَ

*Obey Allah and His Messenger, if ye do believe.*

(Al-Anfal:1)

Then those who were greave with the prophet's invitation for war have been threatened. And then it is said:

وَمَنْ يُشَاقِقِ اللَّهَ وَرَسُولَهُ فَإِنَّ اللَّهَ شَدِيدُ الْعِقَابِ ○

*If any contend against Allah and His Messenger, Allah is strict in punishment.*

(Al-Anfal:13)

In this *ayah* as well as others quoted above, obedience of the prophet is also referred to with the obedience of God. Moreover there is reference of the prophet in every *ayah* and nowhere is the reference of the commander (امير). Also' there is no subtlest hint to the effect that *Rasulullah* means here in the capacity of commander different from prophet hood. Moreover, turning away from the order of the prophet has been refrained and the threat of hard punishment has been given. After this the words clearly mean that after listening to our commands you should never turn away

from obeying the prophet (SAW). The addressees of this are not only those who were present at that time, but whosoever listens to or recites these *ayaat* till the Last day will have to bow his head before the order of the prophet (SAW).

And these words of the author wonderful that duties of the prophet (SAW) as a commander are emergent as so happens with other commanders because we cannot fight today with spear and sword. Obviously, the weapons used by *Rasulullah* (SAW) were according to that time, but the moral rules and regulations used and suggested by him were not temporal but these rules have given a permanent law of war for Muslims. From *shari'ah* point of view it is not important to use sword, gun or cannon. But the importance lies in the question what is your objective of using weapons and how do you exploit them for bloodshed. Model presented by *Rasulullah* (SAW) in wars is forever a perfect model of *Islamic Jihad* and the *Chief of the World* is the Commander- in- Chief, in spirit, of every Muslim army.

The author has told one more difference between command (امارت) and prophet hood (رسالت) i.e. there is a right to differ and dissent from commanders. Now I ask him, if the position of *Rasulullah* as a commander was just like other commanders, whether any Muslim had a right to differ and dissent from him? The commander before whom raising of voice was not allowed and good deeds of entire life could be destroyed as a consequence of speaking in high voice before him (الحجرات), and if one who fights him was threatened by the punishment of fire (النسا), can a Muslim have right to differ and dissent from him? If not, then there is no compare between the command of *Rasulullah* and the command of others.

The author has not kept any distinction between the command of *Rasul* (SAW) and the command of the others, so far so, that all commands which are in the category of obedience of *Rasul* he has counted as the obedience of the commander. He writes in the margin of page 157:

*"Wherever the words Allah and Rasul have come in the Quran together, often the word Rasul points to his command whose law is the Book of Allah and which is established by the prophet or his representatives. For example:"*

يَسْأَلُونَكَ عَنِ الْأَنْفَالِ قُلِ الْأَنْفَالُ لِلَّهِ وَالرَّسُولِ

*They ask thee concerning (things taken as) spoils of war. Say: "(such) spoils are at the disposal of Allah and the Messenger* (Al-Anfal: 1)

"Order about the booty was not limited to the period of prophet hood (رسالت) but it is for future also, the exercise of which is mandatory to the Khilafah."

Then there is a note in the margin of page 158 about the *ayah*:

فَإِنْ تَنَازَعْتُمْ فِي شَيْءٍ فَرُدُّوهُ إِلَى اللَّهِ وَالرَّسُولِ

*If ye differ in anything among yourselves, refer it to Allah and His Messenger* (Al-Nisa: 59)

"Final authority (اختيار) is Allah and *Rasul* i.e. the command (امارت) because the rank of Caliphs will be equal to the rank *Rasul* as commander (امير)".

This is an open exceed from the truth. Noble Quran talks about the obedience of God, prophet and commander. God's obedience means following the commands of the Quran, prophet's obedience means following the actions and sayings of the prophet (SAW), and obedience of commanders means following the commanders and governors of Muslims. About the first two it has been said in the Quran not only once but many



time that there is no chance of ifs and buts in the commands of God and the prophet. Duty of Muslims is to listen and obey. Nobody has a right to decide in his matters by himself after God's or prophet's decision. As for the third, it has been told that the obedience of the governors is within the limits the commands of God and *Rasul* referring to God and *Rasul* is compulsory in case of difference. In presence of such explicit teachings there no need allowance to consider God and *Rasul* as command (امارت) and to combine the position of *Rasul* as commander with the command (امارت) available to Muslims in general. Evidence presented in this connection from *Surah Anfal*: 1 (قُلْ الْكُفَالُ لِلّٰهِ وَ الرَّسُولِ) Say: "(such) spoils are at the disposal of Allah and the Messenger") is not correct. "War booty is for Allah and *Rasul*" means that this wealth should be utilized in meeting the requirements of the system of Islamic party established by God and *Rasul*. How can it be derived from it that Allah and *Rasul* mean the command (امارت)?

### **Viewpoint of the Author about *Hadith*:**

The author has opted for nearly the same viewpoint about the *hadith* like a concernable group of those who reject the *hadith*. He writes:

An aspect of the teaching of book was also that *Rasul* should practically demonstrate its commands.

Thus our prophet practically demonstrated all commands of the Quran like prayer, fasting, hajj, alms giving etc. and Muslims began to act accordingly. This best model is with the *ummah* in the form of continuous action (عمل متواتر), which it is continuously following generation after generation. Therefore, it is sure and religious. Differing from it is differing from the Quran."

The author has written at another place, “uncertain things have no place in religion (دين)”. From these writings and above explications the viewpoint of the author becomes clear as follows:

1. Judicial decisions of the prophet (SAW) and those rules which he framed and applied for political, war, civilizational and public matters as a commander are out of that model of *Rasul* for which the general command of the Quran is to obey. Therefore, they are not required now because duties of command are emergent and the environment also changes with time.

2. Only in those matters the action (not the sayings) of *Rasul* is to be imitated which belong to worship and religion and in which the *Rasul* (SAW) has himself told the way of action on the commands of the Quran.

3. In view of the author only that continuous action is certain which is continuous from the period of *Rasul* and which every generation has followed after observing the preceding generation. As for those narrations which are found in *hadith* about the words and actions of *Rasul* (SAW), they are not certain and have no place in religion.

I say with certainty about the first two of these that they are totally against the Quran. There is not a faintest hint in the Quran on the basis of which it could be said that only the religious actions of *Rasul* (SAW) are to be imitated forever and his decision in matters of civilization and social collectivity and his applied laws were especially for the period in which they were applied. If there is any *ayah* based on which the two types of actions could be differentiated, the *ayah* should be presented. I find this clear command in the Quran:

وَمَا كَانَ لِمُؤْمِنٍ وَلَا مُؤْمِنَةٍ إِذَا قَضَى اللَّهُ وَرَسُولُهُ أَمْرًا أَنْ  
يَكُونُوا لَهُمُ الْخِيَرَةُ مِنْ أَمْرِهِمْ وَمَنْ يَعْصِ اللَّهَ وَرَسُولَهُ وَقَدْ  
ضَلَّ ضَلَالًا مُبِينًا ۝

*It is not fitting for a Believer, man or woman, when a matter has been decided by Allah and His Messenger to have any option about their decision: if any one disobeys Allah and His Messenger, he is indeed on a clearly wrong Path.*  
(Al-Ahzab: 36)

There is no limit of time in this ayah. *Momin* and *Mo'mina* cannot mean to be the believer men and women. Word *amr* is also quite general which comprehend all types of affairs related to religion or the world. Allah and *Rasul* means only Allah and *Rasul*, never the 'command' (امارت), because the commanders or governors will be after all the believers, and here the right of all believers men or women to decide of their own, collectively or individually, has been detained in all matters which have been decided by Allah and *Rasul*. Then it has been said that "if any one disobeys Allah and His Messenger, he is indeed on a clearly wrong Path". This part of the *ayah* points to the fact that the system of Islamic Party which Allah and his *Rasul* by his guidance have established through certain rules and laws can sustain only if these rules and laws are correctly followed. If people neglect verbal and practical guidance of Allah and *Rasul* and opt for ways of their own, the system will not sustain and you will go far strayed from the right path as soon as this system is disturbed. It is wondering that despite the presence of such open directions in the Quran, the author of its teachings has opted a way that has been just discussed.

As far as the third point is concerned, I have discussed my views on this in my title "*Hadith* and the Quran". Therefore I need not repeat them here. However I

will ask the author only one question. If any person considers "certain continuous action" the part of religion all those additions and traditions which are being transferred from prophet's period generation after generation, what source do you have to know that this action is not the creation of people? You will that we will refer back to the Quran and reject the addition with the help of its *ayaat*. I say, first of all after neglecting the meaning of the Quran fixed by the words and actions of *Rasul*, a man who likes additions may take such liberty that the refutation of many additions may become difficult. But if you successfully refute the addition with help of the Quran, you cannot refute his claim that these additions have been continuous from the period of the prophet generation after generation. As according to your own view you cannot call them uncertain and also from history (which should also be uncertain like traditions) you cannot argue that these additions were not there in the period of *Rasul*, but began that period. Now you can only consider them as certain, then either you have to follow them say that the action of the prophet was against the words of God. I do not know what solution of this intricacy the author and his co-thinkers do have with them?

**Tarjumanul Quran, Rajab, 1354 A.H.; October 1934 C.E.**

## Personal and Prophetic Capacity of a Messenger

Two essays of this book, "Islamic Concept of Freedom" and "Following and Obedience of the Prophet" were translated into Arabic and published in the journal "*Al-Muslimun*". Scholars of Syria pointed that there is some contradiction between the two which should be removed. Moreover, a friend from Damascus wrote following objection on the first mentioned essay.

"Does Muhammad (SAW) as a man have a position of common man among us? And does he have in him, as a man, such wishes based on which he exerts on people his personal dignity and ties them in the shackles of power? If it is true then what means his being innocent as prophet and protected as man? What is the use of these details of his life if he was only a man and Allah had not raised his status by giving the office of the prophet? Have his manly and prophetic positions become one after being Rasul or are they separate? Can these two positions be separated so that Muhammad, the Rasul should be obeyed and we are free to differ from Muhammad the man? If there is any general principle in the light of which we could distinguish between his human words, we could differ from, and his prophetic words mandatory to follow?

Is there no barrier in differing from the personal opinion of prophet? Did Muhammad (SAW) blew the spirit in his companions that as a man his following is not necessary, instead supported them in differing from him in matters of his personal opinion? Moreover, is it true that Hadrat Omar differed with him (the man) on the same basis .....?

Following essay was written in response to the above objections.

It has been pointed to me through "*Al-Muslimun*" Vol. VI, VII and VIII that there is some contradiction in my essays published by the titles "Islamic Concept of Freedom" and "Following and Obedience of Prophet" which requires resolution. It has been said in the first essay that personal and prophetic positions of *Rasul* are separate and Islamic invitation is directed to the obedience of the position of *Rasul* not to his personal position. But in second essay this claim has been denied and it has been said with perfect resolution that *Rasul* had only one position which was as being the *Rasul*. How coordination between both of your views can be brought about. Moreover, a friend from Damascus has raised some questions on my second essay in "*Al-Muslimun*" Vol. VII. Because both of these objections are closely related, I am responding only in one and short essay.

In fact there are two aspects of this problem. One is theoretical in the sense that, what in fact the truth is? The other is practical in the sense that as far as extracting guidance from *Rasul* is concerned, whether he is as a whole *Rasul* and only the *Rasul* for us, or we shall divide his personality into two parts and obey only his position of *Rasul* and leave personal position?

Now consider the first i.e. the theoretical part. The noble Quran is quite clear in that there is a difference between the personal and prophetic positions of messengers. They are sent not to make people their own servants but to make Allah's servants:

مَا كَانَ لِبَشَرٍ أَنْ يُؤْتِيَهُ اللَّهُ الْكِتَابَ وَالْحُكْمَ وَالنَّبُوءَةَ ثُمَّ يَقُولُ  
لِلنَّاسِ كُونُوا عِبَادًا لِي مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ وَلَكِنْ كُونُوا رَبَّانِيِّينَ ۝

*It is not (possible) that a man, to whom is given the Book, and Wisdom, and the prophetic office, should say to people: "Be ye my worshippers rather than Allah's": on*

*the contrary (He would say) "Be ye worshippers of Him Who is truly the Cherisher of all (Aal-e-Imran: 79)*

Two duties were offered to them simultaneously. One was that they should bring out people from the obedience of others than God including his own self. Second was that they should bring people to obey only one God.

وَلَقَدْ بَعَثْنَا فِي كُلِّ أُمَّةٍ رَسُولًا أَنِ اعْبُدُوا اللَّهَ وَاجْتَنِبُوا  
الطَّاغُوتَ ○

*For We assuredly sent amongst every People a messenger, (with the Command, " Serve Allah, and eschew Evil"* (Al-Nahl: 36)

قُلْ يَا أَهْلَ الْكِتَابِ تَعَالَوْا إِلَى كَلِمَةٍ سَوَاءٍ بَيْنَنَا وَبَيْنَكُمْ  
أَلَّا نَعْبُدَ إِلَّا اللَّهَ وَلَا نُشْرِكَ بِهِ شَيْئًا وَلَا يَتَّخِذَ بَعْضُنَا  
بَعْضًا أَرْبَابًا مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ ○

*Say: "O People of the Book! Come to common terms as between us and you: That we worship none but Allah; that we associate no partners with him; that we erect not, from among ourselves, Lords and patrons other than Allah".* (Aal-e-Imran: 64)

Religious command to obey them without ifs and buts was not on the basis of their personal right. It was only because that only *Rasul* is that person through whom Allah expresses his pleasure to his servants and sends his commands. That is why the obedience of *Rasul* was declared as the obedience of Allah.

وَمَا أَرْسَلْنَا مِنْ رَسُولٍ إِلَّا لِيُطَاعَ بِإِذْنِ اللَّهِ

*We sent not a messenger, but to be obeyed, in accordance with the will of Allah.* (Al-Nisa: 94)

مَنْ يُطِيعِ الرَّسُولَ فَقَدْ أَطَاعَ اللَّهَ ○

*He who obeys the Messenger, obeys Allah (Al-Nisa: 80)*

This is also proved from the Quran and the *hadiths* of the prophet that he never demanded to obey, without

question, any thing which he said or did out of his opinion as against his rule about those things which were from God. I have given many examples to this effect in my essay "*Islamic Concept of Freedom*". Particularly the example of *Hadrat Zaid* which is very explicit in which he divorced to *Saiyyida Zainab* (RA) against the prophet's opinion and the prophet did not reject him. There is no explanation of this other than that I have given in my essay. And the prophet himself has told about it in the case of cross pollination of dates.

إِنَّمَا أَنَا بَشَرٌ إِذَا أَمَرْتُكُمْ بِشَيْءٍ مِنْ دِينِكُمْ فَخُذُوا بِهِ وَإِذَا  
أَمَرْتُكُمْ بِشَيْءٍ مِنْ رَأْيِي فَإِنَّمَا أَنَا بَشَرٌ — إِنَّمَا ظَنَنْتُ ظَنًّا فَلَا  
تُؤَاخِذُونِي بِالظَّنِّ وَلَكِنْ إِذَا حَدَّثْتُكُمْ مِنَ اللَّهِ شَيْئًا فَخُذُوا بِهِ  
فَإِنِّي لَمْ أَكْذِبْ عَلَى اللَّهِ — أَنْتُمْ أَعْلَمُ بِأَمْرِ دُنْيَاكُمْ

*I am also a man. Obey me when I give you a command about your religion. And when I say something out of my opinion, I am also a man. I said something by guess. Do not take those things which I say out of opinion and guess. However, follow everything I say from God because I never speak lie about God. You know better about your matters of the world.*

*(Sahih Muslim, kitabul Fazail).*

This is the difference in principle and theory. Now consider its practical aspect:

In fact it was a very delicate and intricate matter that Allah sent a man among human being to represent Himself and gave him dual responsibility. On the one hand he had to free humanity from obeying all creatures including himself and train them by himself for this freedom; and on the other hand the same person should make people obey Allah without question, and the source of all these obedience for all practical purposes should also be the same person as prophet. These two contrasting



works were to be done by single person simultaneously while their boundaries were so intermixed together that except Allah and his messenger no other person could have drawn a line of demarcation. Delicacy and intricacy of the matter increases more if we think upon three things.

First of all, when the prophet (SAW) made his companions to obey him according to Allah's commands he was obviously performing the duty of a *Rasul*. But when he was to train his highly obedient companions for freedom of thought and opinion by making them free from slavery of his own personal self; when he made them learn using stability of thought before all men by encouraging them to differ from his personal opinions; when he was drawing a line of demarcation between his personal and prophetic position to tell here you are free and here you have no way except to listen and obey; at that time also he was performing a part of prophethood. This is the point where it becomes difficult for us to understand the difference of his prophetic and personal positions and practically differentiate between the two. These two positions look so intermixed that only theoretical difference remains between them; practically, during engagements in his personal position also he was performing the work of a prophet.

Matters which are obviously quite personal like eating and drinking of a man, dressing, marriage, living with family, working at home, taking bath, washing and evacuation etc. are not matters purely personal in prophet's (SAW) self but included in them also is the teaching of *shar'i* limits, methods and norms and it is difficult for a man to differentiate by himself where the position of prophesy ends and position of a man begins.

Thirdly, the noble Quran tells us that the prophets self as a whole is a model for us, whose every aspect and

direction provides the light of guidance and no act or speech of that person is polluted the least with straying and non obedience.

لَقَدْ كَانَ لَكُمْ فِي رَسُولِ اللَّهِ أُسْوَةٌ حَسَنَةٌ ۝

*Ye have indeed in the Messenger of Allah a beautiful pattern of conduct* (33: 21)

يَا أَيُّهَا النَّبِيُّ إِنَّا أَرْسَلْنَاكَ شَاهِدًا وَمُبَشِّرًا وَنَذِيرًا وَدَاعِيًا

إِلَى اللَّهِ بِأَذْنِهِ وَسِرَاجًا مُنِيرًا ۝

*O Prophet! Truly We have sent thee as a Witness, a Bearer of Glad Tidings, and Warner-, And as one who invites to Allah's (grace) by His leave, and as a lamp spreading light* (33: 45,46)

مَا ضَلَّ صَاحِبُكُمْ وَمَا غَوَى ۝ وَمَا يَنْطِقُ عَنِ الْهَوَى ۝ إِنْ

هُوَ إِلَّا وَحْيٌ يُوحَى ۝

*Your Companion is neither astray nor being misled. Nor does he say (aught) of (his own) Desire. It is no less than inspiration sent down to him.* (53: 2-4)

Because of these facts it is neither possible for us to differentiate between the personal and prophetic positions of *Rasul* nor allowed by *shari'ah* and decide their limits ourselves and also decide through our own reasoning that those words or instructions were in personal capacity about which we are free from following and obedience. The only source of knowing about this distinction is either the clarification of the prophet himself, or any *shar'i* principle inferred from his own teachings.

Many examples are found in the period of *Rasul* (SAW) that his companions asked the *Rasul* before expressing their opinion whether your command or action is based on Allah's command or on your opinion? When they knew that it was based on his opinion, they gave their suggestion. Thus at the time of *Badr*, *Hadrat* Hubab bin Munzar asked whether the choice of this place is based on

revelation against which we are not allowed to do any thing, or it is simply a technique of war? Similarly on a suggestion of treaty with the convoy of *Bani Ghatfan* at the time of the Battle of Trench, *Hadrat Sa'd bin Ma'az* before giving his opinion asked, "O, the prophet of God! "Is your intention based on revelation against which we can dare nothing to say, or you want to do this based on your opinion"?

Sometimes the prophet (SAW) himself told that I am telling this not from Allah as a religious duty but it is my point of view as above the words of prophet (SAW) have passed about pollination of dates.

And sometimes the nature of the event itself pointed to the fact that the prophet (SAW) said something in personal capacity. For example his saying to *Hadrat Zaid*:

It was clear in this connection that this was not a *shar'i* command of the prophet to a believer but it was an advisement of an elder person of a family to another family member. That is why *Hadrat Zaid* divorced *Hadrat Zainub* despite his advisement, and because there came no rejection from Allah and *Rasul*, it is proved that *Hadrat Zaid* figured out its correct nature.

These are the examples of Prophet's period. However, there are many other cases in which the difference may be known in the light of *Shar'i* principle. Consider the dress and food of the prophet (SAW). One aspect of this was that he used to wear a particular type of dress which was used in the Arab of that period and his own likeness was also included in it. Similarly he ate foods generally prepared in Arab at that time and in them also his choice was included. The other aspect was that in the same food and dress he taught the limits of *shari'ah* and norms of Islam through his action and sayings. Now we come to know through the *shar'i* principle taught by

the prophet (SAW) himself that the first thing in them was related to his personal capacity and second thing to his prophetic position. It is because the *shari'ah* has not taken into consideration to teach people what type of dress they should wear or which kind and how backed type of food should they eat? But it has taken into consideration to fix limits of praiseworthy (حلال) and blameworthy (حرام), permitted (جائز), not permitted (ناجائز), and teach people those norms which have affinity to Islamic moral and culture.

Either we know about the difference by the prophetic declaration of through the *shar'i* principle taught by him, in any case its source is the prophetic teachings alone. It means that we shall refer to his prophetic position to know his works of personal positions. We can decide nothing about matters of his personal position directly by overlooking his prophetic position. It is this fact that I have pointed to the refuters of *sunnah* in my essay "*Following and Obedience of Prophet*". Their mistake is that they differentiate in their own way, between Muhammad ibn Abdullah as a prophet and as a man, and make a line of demarcation between his works as a prophet and as a man. Moreover, they have considered themselves free from the boundary of his life which they have distinguished as personal, though whatever difference is there on real grounds, it is in presence of Allah and his messenger; and we have been told about it only to save us from straying in doctrine lest we begin to understand Muhammad (SAW) bin Abdullah as true commander instead of Allah. But for *ummah* he has only one position i.e. the position of a prophet. So far so that if we are free in some of his personal command, that too from the relief given by him as a messenger. *Rasul*

himself defines the boundaries of this freedom and he himself has given us training of utilizing it.

No misunderstanding will remain, *inshallah*, if both of my essays are studied together with these explanations.

**Tarjumanul Quran: December, 1956**

## Prophet hood and Related Instructions

My friend Mr. Chaudhry Ghulam Ahmad Pervez has made following comments in a long letter on my essay *"Following and Obedience of Prophet"*.

"But I have some difference of opinion with you on your explanation of the *ayah*

وَمَا يَنْطِقُ عَنِ الْهَوَىٰ

*Nor does he say (aught) of (his own) Desire—(Al-Najm: 2).*

You have written:

"The time from which Allah *ta'ala* made him prophet till his last breath he was all the time and conditions the prophet of Allah. His every act and word was in the capacity of prophet".

Then you write:

"Whatever he did in whichever time and condition, he did in the capacity of prophet".

Your purpose is clear: every word and action of prophet was from Allah and because it was in the capacity of prophet it had to be obeyed by Muslim *Ummah*.

Here I feel enough to give only two hints. First consider the Quran. You will find some cases where *Rasulullah* (SAW) has been threatened and corrected. For example he took swear not to eat a kind of honey. That is why the revelation came:

يَا أَيُّهَا النَّبِيُّ لِمَ تُحَرِّمُ مَا أَحَلَّ اللَّهُ لَكَ

*O Prophet! Why holdest thou to be forbidden that which Allah has made lawful to thee?* (Al-Tahreem: 1)

Obviously if the prophet's making honey prohibited for him was decided from Allah, why He objected the prophet? At another place it said:

عَفَا اللَّهُ عَنْكَ لِمَ أَذْنَتْ لَهُمْ

*Allah gives thee grace! Why didst thou grant them leave*  
(Al-Tauba: 43)

Now, if the leave given by the prophet was directed by revelation and the act was as a prophet, why the One Who revealed threatened? Similarly:

عَبَسَ وَتَوَلَّى أَنْ جَاءَهُ الْأَعْمَى

*(The Prophet) frowned and turned away. Because there came to him the blind man (interrupting)* (Abas: 1, 2)

If wrinkles appeared on the forehead of his exalted sir were in the capacity of prophet, why there is warning on this in the Quran?

It is obvious from the above facts that these acts and words of his exalted sir were in his personal capacity. It does not mean that (God save us) that these matters were because of misguidance, straying and lust but during dealing with the matters of world in the capacity of man the attribute of manhood was with him in which ordinary errors have no meaning. And from this a living witness is obtained in favour of the moral of his majesty and the Quran being a Book of Allah. Shah Waliullah writes in "*Hujjatullahil Baligha*" that the sayings of the prophet are of two types. One type is of those sayings which are related to the duty of prophet hood. The other type is not related to this duty. The prophet (SAW) has said about the later as follows:

إِنَّمَا أَنَا بَشَرٌ مِثْلُكُمْ إِذَا أَمَرْتُكُمْ بِشَيْءٍ مِنْ دِينِكُمْ فَخُذُوا بِهِ وَإِذَا أَمَرْتُكُمْ بِشَيْءٍ مِنْ رَأْيِي فَأَتَمُّوا إِنَّا بَشَرٌ -  
إِنِّي ظَنَنْتُ ظَنًّا وَلَا تَوَاحِدُونِي بِالظَّنِّ وَلَكِنْ إِذَا حَدَّثْتُكُمْ مِنْ اللَّهِ بِشَيْءٍ فَخُذُوا بِهِ فَإِنِّي لَمْ أَكْذِبْ عَلَى اللَّهِ -

*I am also a man. Obey me when I give you a command about your religion. And when I say something out of my opinion, I am also a man. I said something by guess. Do*

*not take those things which I say out of opinion and guess. However, follow everything I say from God because I never speak lie about God. You know better about your matters of the world. (Sahih Muslim, kitabul Fazail)*

Thus Shah Waliullah says that these matters include those which he did as habit, or by chance and without intention or to narrate something. Then he gives examples of these and includes in these examples which had partial importance in his period and were not obligatory and compulsory for the whole *Ummah*.

Then it is obvious that what he said about religion was in the capacity of *Rasul*, be it a revelation or reasoning (اجتهاد) of *Rasul* and only that is compulsory to be followed by the *ummah*. And what he said as a man was conditioned with this bond. That is why we observe that the companions (RA), in matters of opinion seeking, offered their opinion and also they were acted upon. Not only this, but there was also an action against this type of advisement. Thus the Quran is witness to the fact that he said to *Hadrat Zaid*, "keep your wife with you" (امسك عليك زوجك) but he divorced her wife. Was his advisement in the capacity of a *Rasul*, can you think that *Hadrat Zaid* would have gone against? There are some cases in the books of *hadith* that the companions (RA) asked the *Rasul*, "Are you saying it as a messenger or it is your opinion"? Thus at the time of Badr when the prophet fixed the camp at a place, one of the companions asked the same question and when it was known to him that *Rasul* (SAW) is doing it out of his opinion he requested, "It is better to fix the camp a little ahead", and the request was accepted by the prophet.

It is evident from these events that his majesty was not a prophet every time and in all conditions and his each word and act was not in the capacity of *Rasul*. Yes, the case of a man of God is quite different who likes to colour himself totally in the colour of the beloved. But there is a



great difference between this situation and obligation (وجوب). Though Shah Waliullah has given *Rasul's* decisions also this category which were not in the capacity of *Rasul* (perhaps his aim was temporal decisions, and perhaps on the same basis the author of "*Ta'limaat*" has differentiated between prophet hood (*risaalat*) and command (امارت), but I consider the decisions of *Rasul* related to religion as a part of prophet hood and obligatory. However, one more thing that has come to my mind during the study of this discussion and, though the author of "*Ta'limaat*" has not discussed it in detail, but perhaps he also means the same I think. As far as the prophet is concerned, his obedience in religious matters is till the Last Day without the question of two capacities. There was neither any right of argumentation in this before nor it is now. But the question is that if the Quran commands to refer to Allah and *Rasul* today in absence of *Rasul*, it is necessary for the stability of Islamic system that there should be an authority who could tell this is the decision of God and *Rasul* or could himself apply such decision in temporal matters. Obviously, if true Caliph is present and with him his council (مجلس شوری) elected through a correct way is active, the same group i.e. the caliph-in-Council is that final authority which will represent God and *Rasul* for the Muslim *Ummah*. It means that the decision of this council will be final and nobody will have a right to raise question against it. If, otherwise, everybody is allowed to accomplish the duty of consulting God and *Rasul* (فردوه الى الله والرسول), the Islamic system can never be established. This will be the Supreme Council with no appeal against its decisions. And the same council will develop *Fiqh*. However, if any member of this council applies decisions against the Book and *Sunnah* the public (جمهور) will have right to dismiss him

and elect any other person in his place, because here it will be rightful to differ from those who do not bring the *ummah* to the obedience of God and prophet. But individually no one will have the right to differ and disobey their decisions because in his view they are against the book and *sunnah*. Only this empowered council will have the right to decide against previous decisions or management, based on expedience in temporal matters as is mentioned in the books of *seerat* and *hadiths*. The prophet (SAW) allowed the Christians of Najran and the Jews of Khaibar to stay at their place, but *Hadrath* Omar in his period ousted them when required. And, as we know, the fact that the Caliphs of the time (eg. *Hadrat* Omar and *Hadrat* Ali) also used to stand before the court as defendants also tells that people had the right to differ from even Caliphs. It should be known that they did not distinguish between the Caliph and his personal capacity. Omar bin Khattab and Ali bin abi Talib used to appear in courts. And claims were against their selves not against the Caliph in Council. This is the distinguishing feature of Islamic system of governance that it did not exempt the employers of law from the law. This should also be clear that the position of "The Caliph in Council" will not be that of the law maker. But as far as the principle of law is concerned, these have been fixed in the book and *sunnah* for ever. Now the application of these principles or making rules in particular matters will be the duty of this council. Perhaps in the view of the author of "*Ta'limaat*" is the same situation as have described when he says, "Wherever there is in the Quran the command to obey God and prophet, its hint is towards the "*amarat*". If it is correct then there is no point of objection that the obedience of this authorized council is exactly the

obedience of Rasul and its disobedience is the disobedience of God and Rasul as the *Rasul* (SAW) says:

مَنْ يُطِيعِ الْأَمِيرَ فَقَدْ أَطَاعَنِي وَمَنْ عَصَى الْأَمِيرَ فَقَدْ عَصَانِي.

*One, who obeyed the commander, obeyed me and the one who disobeyed the commander, disobeyed me.*

The discussion has become long. But I hope there would be many useful things in it. One thing to say in the last; as I have addressed you, I have presented only those matters about which I required more satisfaction through your answer. As for those matters which I favour or those matters of the author of the "*Ta'limaat*" which I differ from, I have not repeated: and these presentations are also to seek satisfaction (ليطمئن قلبي)."

In the case of the obedience of *Rasul* this matter is generally acceptable that he cannot be a commander or leader in his personal capacity. Neither, the obedience and following of Moses (AS) is because he is Moses, the son of Imran, nor it is of Jesus (AS) because he is Jesus, the son of Marry, nor Muhammad's (SAW) obedience and following is necessary because he is Muhammad, the son of Abdullah. Obedience and following, whatsoever, is because these noble men are the prophets of Allah. Allah provided them the knowledge of truth that was not given to common people, gave them guidance not given to others, taught them such correct methods of passing life in the world according to His Will which were not taught to other persons, the methods which other people could not know by using their own reason or with the help of other people except prophets. Now the only topic of difference is, in which matter is the obedience and following of Rasul and to what extent?

A group says that the obedience and following is only of that book which the *Rasul* has brought. After conveying the book the capacity of prophet hood of the

prophet finishes. After it he is a man like other men. If other men are commanders or leaders, their obedience will be bounding only to maintain system and discipline. But it will not be a religious duty. If other men are scholars, wise and lawyers, they will be obeyed according to their merit and this obedience will be optional not compulsory. Same is the case of *Rasulullah*. Capacity of Rasul is only personal except in the conveyance of the book. If he is a commander as a man his obedience is only in his presence not permanent. If he is a judge his decisions will apply only within the limits of his jurisdiction. Outside these limits they will be considered only as examples, not as prescriptions of *shari'ah* and description of law. If he is wise his advisements will be considered according to their merits as are considered similar decisions of other scholars and intellectuals. They will not be considered part of religion only because they have been said by a person holding the office of prophet hood. Similarly, if he is a man of noble character and his life is best according to methods, norms and dealings, then we shall consider it a model as we are free to choose decent life of an ordinary person as a model. But any of his actions or words will not be a law in moral, social, economic and dealing whose following should be compulsory to us. This is the viewpoint of that group which is now-a-days known as "*Ahlul Quran*".

Another group makes a little amendment to this viewpoint. This group says, only conveying the book was not the duty of *Rasul* it included the demonstration of how to practice the commands of the book so that the *ummah* may follow the same model. Thus the following of the detailed practical forms of commands related to worship and prayer which have been given by the prophet, is also the following of the book and a religious duty. As for

those matters other than command of the book which a prophet accomplishes in personal capacity as a commander, judge, reformer, wise, citizen and a member of the group of Muslims, there nothing in them which should a permanent universal rule and law and whose obedience should be a religious duty for ever. Maulana Aslam Jayrajpuri represents this group.

There is a third group who considers the capacity of the prophet hood of *Rasul* comprehending a large part of his life. In many matters like moral, society, dealings, commands, judgment and many others this group believes that the words and actions of prophet are from God and also considers them best model for *ummah*. However, this group distinguishes between the capacity of prophet hood and man; and according to sit there are of necessity some aspects of the life of *Rasul* which are out of his capacity of prophet hood and not to be imitated, though this group does not draw a line of demarcation to tell after this line the capacity of *Rasul* remains no more and that of a man begins. I understand that Mr. Chaudhry belongs to this group and I want to declare at the outset that his viewpoint is nearer to truth more than above two groups. He is little mistaken but *Alhamdu Lillah* it does not touch boundaries of misguidance.

The fourth group says that even though the personal and prophetic capacities are two in theory but in reality both are one and it is not possible to practically differentiate between them. The office of prophet hood is not like the offices of the world so that as long as the post holder is sitting on the chair he is the officer and as soon as he left the chair he is a common man. Instead, as soon as *Rasul* is declared as *Rasul* he is always and every time on duty till his last breath and he cannot perform any activity against the policy of the authority he has to

represent. His capacity of prophet hood comprehends all matters of his life no matter he works as a leader, commander, judge, teacher of moral, a citizen, member of a society, husband, father, brother, relative or friend. In all these aspects of life his capacity of prophet hood is so comprehensive that his responsibilities as a prophet never separate from him even for a moment. Even if he is alone with his wife, he is the prophet of Allah just as he is His prophet when leading prayer in the mosque. Whatever he does in any department of life is under the guidance of Allah. There is always and all the time strong vigilance of Allah on his actions. He is bound to act within the limits fixed by Allah and he shows by his words, actions and entire behavior that these are the principles on which the system of man's life should stand. And these are the boundaries within which human freedom of action should remain limited. The prophet accomplishes this duty in his persona and family life as he does in official capacity. And he is warned at once on minor slip of step because his mistake is not only his but mistake of entire *ummah*. The sole objective of his sending is to present the perfect model of a Muslim's life after living within people. Not only that he should guide them individually in their personal life and make them Muslims individually but also bring about a true Muslim society by establishing Islamic civilizational, political, economic and moral system. Therefore, his protection from mistake necessary so that he may be obeyed with perfect trust and his words and actions may be considered a complete standard of Islamic teaching and being Islamic. There is no doubt that there a difference of grade in the words and actions of the prophet. Some of them are obligatory; others are liked while some of them are for perfection. However, the life of prophet as a whole is a model which has been presented

before human being to emulate and mold their life accordingly. A person will be as much perfect a man and a Muslim as much higher he will go in this emulation. And the one who will fall down even lower than the least required grade will be the transgressor, sinner, misguided and punished.

In my view this last group is on truth. And the more I think on the Quran in the light of reason I become more certain about the truth of this view. When I look at the history of prophets discussed in the Quran I do not think that Allah *ta'ala* takes any person passing by the street and gives him the duty of conveying His book, or gives the office of prophesy to do His work together with other works as if he is part time worker who accomplishes a particular work during a fixed time after which he may do anything. In contrast to I see whenever Allah *ta'ala* has decided to sent a prophet in any nation he has created a person especially for this purpose. He has given to him grand attributes of humanity and high level mental and spiritual powers necessary for accomplishing the duties of this venerated office. He has arranged for his best nourishment and training from the time of his birth. He has protected him from moral evils, misguidance and mistakes even before prophet hood prevented him from dangers and has nourished him in situations best suited for bringing prophetic ability from potentiality to actuality and when he has reached a proper point of growth Allah provided him knowledge, ability of judgment and light of guidance and bestowed to him His office of prophet hood. And he has taken the job from him in such way that his entire life till last breath has become engaged in performing only this duty. He had no engagement in the world other than the recitation of the *ayaat*, teaching of the book and wisdom and cleansing the hearts. Day and

night, sitting and standing walking and moving all the time he thinks to bring the misguided ones to the right path and then make them able to rise to the highest level of virtues. He has always been a whole time worker without leave and fixed working time. He has been under strong vigilance of God so that he may not commit any mistake. He has been protected from following lust and devilish doubts. Matters have not been left purely on the jurisdiction of his humane reason and inference but wherever his wishes or inference have deflected him as little as a hair's thickness from the straight path he has been straightened through warning. It is because he has sent to show the servants of God the straight path; had deflected from it equal to a hair's thickness the common people would have gone miles away.

The Quran is a witness and supporter of each word I have just said.

1. That the prophets were named even before birth as prophets and they were created especially for this office is clear from the history of different prophets. For example Abraham (AS) was informed about Isaac's (AS) birth and prophet hood.

وَبَشَّرْنَاهُ بِإِسْحَاقَ نَبِيًّا مِّنَ الصَّالِحِينَ وَبَارَكْنَا عَلَيْهِ وَعَلَىٰ إِسْحَاقَ ۚ

*And We gave him the good news of Isaac – a prophet-one of the righteous. We blessed him and Isaac*

(Al-Saffat: 112)

*Hadrat* Jacob (AS) comes to know even in the childhood of *Hadrat* Joseph (AS) that God will give respect to this child and bless him like Abraham and Isaac (AS). *Hadrat* Zakariyya prays for a child and he is informed as follows:

إِنَّ اللَّهَ يُشْرِكُ بِبَيْحِي مُصَدِّقًا بِكَلِمَةٍ مِّنَ اللَّهِ وَسَيِّدًا  
وَحْصُورًا وَنَبِيًّا مِّنَ الصَّالِحِينَ



*"Allah doth give thee glad tidings of Yahya, confirming the truth of a word from Allah, and (be besides) noble, chaste, and a prophet, - of the goodly company of the righteous. (Al-e-Imran: 39)*

An angel is especially sent to *Hadrat Maryam* to give glad tidings of a pious son, and special arrangements are made by God at the time of his birth (see *surah Maryam* section 2). Then also look to the events of that Israelite grazer who was called in the holy valley of *Tua* for conversation with God. He was also not like common grazers. He was created especially to destroy tyrannical Pharaoh in Egypt and to provide freedom to the children of Israel. He was put in a box to float in the river by God's suggestion to prevent him from murder and sent to the house of his enemy whom he had to destroy. He was given lovely and attractive face so that the family of Pharaoh may have for him a good place in heart.

وَالْقَيْثُ عَلَيْكَ مَحَبَّةً مِّنِّي

*But I endued thee with love from Me (Taha: 39)*

His mouth was locked for the milk of all women so that in the last he reached in the lap of his own mother and he was nurtured under the vigilance of God.

وَلِتُصْنَعَ عَلَيَّ عَيْنِي

*And (this) in order that thou may be reared under my eye (Taha: 39)*

These are some of the examples which show that the prophets are created especially for prophet hood.

1. Then look, those who are created in this way are not like common people but they come equipped with extraordinary abilities. Their nature is perfectly pure, mental frame always gives right things. They are not capable of seeing and predicting wrong. They are provided with such instincts that without discursive reason only through intuition they can derive correct inferences that other people are not capable to reach at even after

reasoning. Their knowledge is not derived, it is instinctive and given. Distinction between true and false, right and wrong is ordained in their temperament. They naturally think right, speak truth and do correct works. Jacob's (AS) example is at hand. As soon as he listens to the dream of Joseph (AS) the idea strike to his heart that the elder brothers will not let this child live. His brothers want to take to play with and *Hadrat* Jacob not only feels their bad intention but also tells about the false statement they were to make.

وَأَخَافُ أَنْ يَأْكُلَهُ الذِّئْبُ وَأَنْتُمْ عَنْهُ غَافِلُونَ

*I fear lest the wolf devour him while ye attend not to him.*

(Yusuf: 13)

And when Joseph's brothers show him his shirt stained in blood he says:

بَلْ سَوَّلَتْ لَكُمْ أَنْفُسُكُمْ أَمْرًا

*"Nay but your minds have made up a tale (Yusuf: 18)*

Similarly when after returning from Egypt the brothers of Joseph (AS) tell Jacob (AS) that your son has committed theft and to assure him they even say, 'ask the people of the dwelling we are coming from', *Hadrat* Jacob again says the same thing i.e. this is deception of your heart. He sends his sons back to Egypt and says:

ادْهَبُوا فَتَحَسَّسُوا مِنْ يُوسُفَ وَأَخِيهِ

*Go ye and enquire about Joseph and his brother*

(Yusuf: 87)

And when his sons return from Egypt with the shirt of Joseph (AS) he begins to feel his fragrance from far distance. These show how extraordinary are the powers of hearts and souls of prophets? This is not only the quality of *Hadrat* Jacob (AS) but all prophets are qualified with it. It is said about *Hadrat* Yahya (AS):

وَأَتَيْنَهُ الْحُكْمَ صَبِيًّا وَحَنَانًا مِّنْ لَّدُنَّا وَزَكَاةً

*And We gave him wisdom even as a youth, and pity (for all creatures) as from us, and purity: he was devout.*

(Maryam: 12, 13)

It is said through the tongue of Jesus (AS):

وَجَعَلَنِي مُبَارَكًا أَيْنَ مَا كُنْتُ وَأَوْصَانِي بِالصَّلَاةِ وَالزَّكَاةِ

مَا دُمْتُ حَيًّا وَبِرَّأَبِي الدِّينِ وَلَمْ يَجْعَلْنِي جَبَّارًا شَقِيًّا ○

*And hath made me blessed wheresoever's I be, and hath enjoined on me prayer and zakat as long as I live. "(he hath made me) kind to my mother, and not overbearing or miserable*

(Maryam: 31, 32)

It is said about the last prophet (SAW):

وَإِنَّكَ لَعَلَى خُلُقٍ عَظِيمٍ

*And surely you have sublime morals* (Al-Qalam: 4)

These are all hints to those instinctive and natural perfections with which the prophets take birth. Then Allah *ta'ala* nurtures these natural capabilities and brings them into action and finally gives them what is known as *ilm* and *hukm* (power of decision) and *hidaya* (guidance) and *mubaiyyina* (clear evidence) in the terminology of the Quran. *Hadrat* Noah says to his nation:

وَاعْلَمُ مِنَ اللَّهِ مَا لَا تَعْلَمُونَ-

*And I know from Allah something that you do not know*

(Al-Araf: 62)

For Abraham (AS), observations of the kingdom of heavens and earth are arranged (6:75). And when he comes back after receiving sure knowledge as a result of these observations he says to his father:

يَا أَبَتِ إِنِّي قَدْ جَاءَنِي مِنَ الْعِلْمِ مَا لَمْ يَأْتِكَ فَاتَّبِعْنِي أَهْدِكَ

صِرَاطًا سَوِيًّا ○

*"O my father! To me has come knowledge which has not reached you: so follow me: I will guide you to a way that is even and straight.*

(Maryam: 43)

It is said about *Hadrat* Jacob:

وَإِنَّهُ لَذُو عِلْمٍ لِّمَا عَلَّمْنَاهُ وَلَكِنَّ أَكْثَرَ النَّاسِ لَا يَعْلَمُونَ ○

*He was by our instruction, full of knowledge (and experience): but most men know not. (Yusuf: 68)*

About Joseph (AS) it is said:

وَلَمَّا بَلَغَ أَشُدَّهُ آتَيْنَاهُ حُكْمًا وَعِلْمًا ○

*And when Joseph attained to his full manhood, We gave him (power of) decision and knowledge: thus do We reward those who do right. (Yusuf: 22)*

Same thing has been said about Moses (28: 2), about Lot (21; 5) and also our prophet was bestowed with the same knowledge and power of decision;

وَأَنْزَلَ اللَّهُ عَلَيْكَ الْكِتَابَ وَالْحِكْمَةَ وَعَلَّمَكَ مَا لَمْ تَكُنْ تَعْلَمُ ○

*Allah has sent down to you the Book and Wisdom and taught you what you knew not (before): (Al- Nisa: 113)*

قُلْ إِنِّي عَلَىٰ بَيِّنَةٍ مِنْ رَبِّي ○

*Say; 'For me, I am on a clear sign from my Lord (Al-Anam: 57)*

قُلْ هَذِهِ سَبِيلِي أَدْعُو إِلَى اللَّهِ عَلَىٰ بَصِيرَةٍ أَنَا وَمَنِ اتَّبَعِيَ

*Say: "This is my way; I do invite unto Allah,- with a certain knowledge I and whoever follows me (Yusuf: 108)*

There happens to be such a great difference between a common man and the prophet because of this knowledge as is there between a blind person and one having normal eyes.

إِنْ أَتَّبِعُ إِلَّا مَا يُوحَىٰ إِلَيَّ قُلْ هَلْ يَسْتَوِي الْأَعْمَىٰ وَالْبَصِيرُ ○

*I but follow what is revealed to me. Say: can the blind be held equal to the seeing (Al-Anam: 50)*

It is not only the book discussed in these *ayaat*, but it is a light that is produced in the hearts of prophets. That is why it has been discussed separately and introduced as an attribute of prophets. In this light they observe the truth as

it is, differentiate between wrong and right, decide about matters and think over affairs before them. Scholars of Islam have given it the term minor revelation (*wahi-e-Khafi*), means that internal guidance and insight available those nobilities all the time which they used at each event. The depth of things which other people could not reach even after intellection and were not able to know the truth and reality, the prophets could reach there all of a sudden with the help of that light.

2. After this the noble Quran tells us that Allah *ta'ala* not only gives prophets wisdom, power of decision and extraordinary understanding, but also keeps an eye on them, protects them from mistakes and stray path, should they be as a result of manly or devilish influences or grown in their own hearts. Even if as a man they commit mistake in making inference, Allah *ta'ala* corrects them at once. Look at the story of Joseph (AS). When it was highly possible that the lady of Egyptian king could entice him through her net, Allah *ta'ala* showed him His evidence and protected from vice.

وَلَقَدْ هَمَّتْ بِهِ وَهَمَّ بِهَا لَوْلَا أَنْ رَأَى بُرْهَانَ رَبِّهِ كَذَلِكَ لِنَصْرِفَ عَنْهُ السُّوءَ وَالْفَحْشَاءَ إِنَّهُ مِنْ عِبَادِنَا الْمُخْلَصِينَ ○

*And (with passion) did she desire him, and he would have desired her, but that he saw the evidence of his Lord: thus (did we order) that we might turn away from him (all) evil and indecent deeds: for he was one of Our servants chosen*  
(Yusuf: 24)

When Moses and Aaron were commanded to go to Pharaoh they felt fear that he may treat them harshly. Allah said do not fear I am with you observing and listening (20; 46). Fear was a human weakness which God removed through revelation.

Noah (AS) cried when saw his son drowning (رب ان ابني من اهلي) "O my Lord! Surely my son is of my

family". It was the weakness of a man. God at once cleared the truth to him that he may be your son but not your family because he is unchaste. After all he was a man. His fatherly love suppressed, for the time being, the fact that father, son and brother have no value in matters of truth. God at once raised the curtain from eyes through revelation and Noah (AS) became satisfied.

Such events occurred severally with the last prophet (SAW) also. Whenever he erred in his mental efforts (*Ijtihad*) due to his natural tilt to mercy and kindness, ambition of converting people to Islam, to reconcile the hearts of unbelievers, in trying to repay the tinniest good or gift of others, in desire of bellowing the spirit of faith in hypocrites and sometime as human being, he was corrected by readable revelation i.e. the Quran.

عَبَسَ وَتَوَلَّى أَنْ جَاءَهُ الْأَعْمَى

(Prophet) frowned and turned away because there came to him the blind man (interrupting) (Abas: 1, 2)

مَا كَانَ لِنَبِيِّ أَنْ يَكُونَ لَهُ أُسْرَى

It is not fitting for a prophet that he should have prisoners of war (Al-Anfal: 67)

عَفَا اللَّهُ عَنْكَ لِمَ أَذِنْتَ لَهُمْ

God give you grace! Why did you grant them exemption (Al-taubah: 43)

إِسْتَغْفِرْ لَهُمْ أَوْ لَا تَسْتَغْفِرْ لَهُمْ إِنْ تَسْتَغْفِرْ لَهُمْ سَبْعِينَ مَرَّةً

قَلَنْ يَغْفِرَ اللَّهُ لَهُمْ ○

Whether you ask for their forgiveness or not, if you ask seventy for their forgiveness Allah will not forgive them (Al-taubah: 8)

وَلَا تُصَلِّ عَلَى أَحَدٍ مِنْهُمْ مَاتَ أَبَدًا

Nor do thou ever pray for any of them that dies

(Al-taubah: 84)

يَا أَيُّهَا النَّبِيُّ لِمَ تُحَرِّمُ مَا أَحَلَّ اللَّهُ لَكَ

*O prophet! Why holds you to be forbidden that which Allah has made lawful to you* (Al-tahreem: 1)

All these *ayaat* are witnessing to the same fact. People present these things in evidence to that the prophet committed mistakes and he was not free from error. Especially the Group known as *Ahl al-Quran*, feels pleasure in searching his errors through these *ayaat*. But in fact these are the *ayaat* which explicitly prove that Allah had taken responsibility of protecting his prophet from errors and maintaining his life according to the real standard of truth. This fact is explicit not only from the above *ayaat* but Allah has mentioned it in the Quran a principle. For example he said:

وَلَوْلَا فَضْلُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْكَ وَرَحْمَتُهُ لَهَمَّتْ طَائِفَةٌ مِنْهُمْ أَنْ يُضِلُّوكَ وَمَا يُضِلُّونَ إِلَّا أَنْفُسَهُمْ وَمَا يَضُرُّونَكَ مِنْ شَيْءٍ وَأَنْزَلَ اللَّهُ عَلَيْكَ الْكِتَابَ وَالْحِكْمَةَ وَعَلَّمَكَ مَا لَمْ تَكُنْ تَعْلَمُ ○

*But, for the grace of Allah to you and his mercy, a party of them would certainly have plotted to lead you astray. But in fact they will only lead their own souls astray, and to you they do no harm in the least. For Allah has sent down to you the book and wisdom and taught you what you knew not before.* (Al-Nisa: 113)

وَإِنْ كَادُوا لَيَفْتِنُونَكَ عَنِ الَّذِي أَوْحَيْنَا إِلَيْكَ لِتَفْتَرِيَ عَلَيْنَا غَيْرَهُ وَإِذَا لَا تَخَذُوكَ خَلِيلًا ○ وَلَوْلَا أَنْ تَبَيَّنَكَ لَقَدْ كَذَّبْتَ تَرَكُنَ إِلَيْهِمْ شَيْئًا قَلِيلًا ○

*And their purpose was to tempt you away from that which We had revealed unto you, to substitute in Our name something quite different: (in that case), behold! They would certainly have made you (their) friend! And had we not given you strength, you would nearly have inclined to them a little* (Bani Israil: 73, 74)

وَمَا أَرْسَلْنَا مِنْ قَبْلِكَ مِنْ رَسُولٍ وَلَا نَبِيٍّ إِلَّا إِذَا تَمَنَّى  
 أَلْقَى الشَّيْطَانُ فِي أُمْنِيَّتِهِ فَيَنْسَخُ اللَّهُ مَا يُلْقِي الشَّيْطَانُ ثُمَّ  
 يُحْكِمُ اللَّهُ آيَتِهِ ۝

*Never did We send a messenger or a prophet before you, but, when he framed a desire, Satan threw some (vanity) into his desire: but Allah will cancel anything (vain) that Satan throws in, and Allah will confirm (and establish) His signs: for Allah is full of knowledge. (Al-Hajj: 52)*

Description of above principles and factual examples point to the fact that Allah *ta'ala* has taken responsibility of keeping the life of prophets exactly according to the required standard and he has made strong arrangement to correct at once any error made by him may the matter be personal or public. Now 'if this fact is accepted in principle, it proves that the works of the prophet not objectionable to Allah fall true to the required standard. In other words they are certified by Allah.

The discussion till now is enough to explain that prophet hood is not that a man who is in every way like other people, is all of a sudden selected by God for revelation and except the book revealed to him in other matters his opinions, actions, commands and decisions are not distinct from a common man, as it is thought by the so called *Ahl al-Quran*. Or the only difference between him and the common man is that he is taught complete details of the commands of Book, and if we overlook this particular status, he is a commander like common commanders, a justice like other men, and a leader like a common man. It is the view of Maulana Aslam Jairajpury. Similarly it is also not the truth of prophet hood that it occurs by accident to a person who is to be a prophet, and after this accident the manhood and the prophet hood of the prophet remain separate so that we may divide his life into two departments and select for obedience only the



prophetic department. All the three opinions are baseless. In contrast to these the reality of a prophet in the light of the Quran is that the prophet is not selected after passing through the stages of birth and nourishment, but he is created prophet from the very beginning. Though he is a man and conditioned by all those qualities fixed by God for the nature of a man, but within these limits his manhood is most perfect and equipped with all those powers to the highest level which can be given to a man. His physical, psychological, intellectual and spiritual powers are highly balanced and moderate. His understanding is so fine that he gets and understands the inspirations from God without mental efforts through intuitive powers. Following *ayah* of the Quran hints at this power:

فَالْهَمَّهَا فَجُورَهَا وَتَقْوَاهَا

*And its inspiration as to its wrong and its right*

(Al-Shams: 8)

His nature is so highly pure and correct that he leaves wrong things because of natural inclination and chooses the way of piety. His heart is so perfect that in every case that comes to him he correctly understands the guidance of God as hinted in the following *ayah*:

وَهَدَيْنَاهُ النَّجْدَيْنِ

*And shown him the two highways?*

(Al-balad: 10)

وَمَا كَانَ اللَّهُ لِيُطْلِعَكُمْ عَلَى الْغَيْبِ وَلَكِنَّ اللَّهَ يَجْتَبِي مِنْ

رُسُلِهِ مَنْ يَشَاءُ فَأَمِنُوا بِاللَّهِ وَرُسُلِهِ

*Allah will not leave the believers in the state in which they are now, until he separates what is evil from what is good. Nor Allah will disclose to you the secrets of the unseen, but he chooses of his messengers whom he pleases. So believe in Allah and his messengers.*

(Aal-e-Imran: 179)

His sound heart and healthy nature keeps him away from walking on those tracks which may displease God. And he, by himself, walks on those ways which please God. This is that perfect manhood with which he is in true meaning the active *khalifa* of Allah. The same after gaining vigor and perfection is provided with the status of general guide becomes a glowing lamp after receiving more light from God, called the source of education and command for the good of humanity in general, and known as prophet in religious terms. Thus it is not correct to understand that prophet hood is an accident that occurs to the substance of manhood at a particular time. But the truth is that it is the substance of the perfect manhood which is created with the quality of prophet hood, develops towards activation and finally grows to prophet hood. The office of prophet hood is not like that, a person was given the office of viceroy as in his place any other person also could have been given the same office, but it is by birth, and the personal capacity of a prophet is his prophetic capacity as well. The only difference is that it is potential before declaration while after declaration it becomes active. Its example is like a sweet fruit which is sweet in construction but its sweetness expresses only after its ripening.

Now the meaning of those *ayaat* can be well understood which God has revealed about prophecy and the prophet at different places in the Quran. I present these *ayaat* in sequence to express my viewpoint.

(1)

وَمَا كَانَ اللَّهُ لِيُطْلِعَكُمْ عَلَى الْغَيْبِ وَلَكِنَّ اللَّهَ يَجْتَبِي مِنْ رُسُلِهِ مَنْ يَشَاءُ فَأَمِنُوا بِاللَّهِ وَرُسُلِهِ

*Allah will not leave the believers in the state in which they are now, until He separates what is evil from what is good. Nor will Allah disclose to you the secrets of the*

*unseen, but he chooses of his messengers whom He pleases, so believe in Allah and his messengers*

(Aal-e-Imran: 179)

(2)

وَمَا أَرْسَلْنَا مِنْ رَّسُولٍ إِلَّا لِيُطَاعَ بِإِذْنِ اللَّهِ

*We sent not a messenger, but to be obeyed, in accordance with the leave of Allah*

(Al-Nisa: 64)

(3)

مَنْ يُطِيعِ الرَّسُولَ فَقَدْ أَطَاعَ اللَّهَ

*He who obeys the messenger, obeys Allah*

(Al-Nisa: 80)

(4)

وَالنَّجْمُ إِذَا هَوَىٰ، مَا ضَلَّ صَاحِبُكُمْ وَمَا غَوَىٰ وَمَا يَنْطِقُ  
عَنِ الْهَوَىٰ، إِنْ هُوَ إِلَّا وَحْيٌ يُوحَىٰ ۝

*By the star when it goes down. Your companion is neither astray nor being misled, nor does he say (aught) of (his own) desire. It is no less than inspiration sent down to him:*

(Al-Najm: 1-4)

(5)

إِنْ أَتَّبِعُ إِلَّا مَا يُوحَىٰ إِلَيَّ ۝

*I but follow what is revealed to me*

(Al-Anam: 50)

(6)

لَقَدْ كَانَ لَكُمْ فِي رَسُولِ اللَّهِ أُسْوَةٌ حَسَنَةٌ

*You have indeed in the messenger of Allah an excellent exemplar*

(Al-Ahzab: 21)

(7)

قُلْ إِنْ كُنْتُمْ تُحِبُّونَ اللَّهَ فَاتَّبِعُونِي يُحْبِبْكُمُ اللَّهُ

*Say: "If you do love Allah, follow me; Allah will love you*

(Al-e-Imran: 31)

(8)

إِنَّمَا كَانَ قَوْلَ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ إِذَا دُعُوا إِلَى اللَّهِ وَرَسُولِهِ لِيَحْكُمَ  
بَيْنَهُمْ أَنْ يُقُولُوا سَمِعْنَا وَأَطَعْنَا وَأُولَئِكَ هُمُ الْمُفْلِحُونَ ۝

*The answer of the believers, when summoned to Allah and his messenger, in order that they may judge between them, is no other than this; they say, "We hear and we obey. It is such as these that will prosper" (Al-noor: 51)*

وَإِنْ تُطِيعُوهُ تَهْتَدُوا ۝

*If you obey him, you shall be on right guidance*

(Al-noor: 54)

فَلَا وَرَبِّكَ لَا يُؤْمِنُونَ حَتَّىٰ يُحَكِّمُوكَ فِيمَا شَجَرَ بَيْنَهُمْ ثُمَّ

لَا يَجِدُوا فِيْٓ أَنفُسِهِمْ حَرَجًا مِّمَّا قَضَيْتَ وَيُسَلِّمُوا تَسْلِيمًا ۝ (9)

*But no by the Lord, they can have no (real) faith, until they make you judge in all disputes between them. And find in their souls no resistance against your decision, but accept them with the fullest conviction (Al-Nisa: 65)*

(10)

وَمَا كَانَ لِمُؤْمِنٍ وَلَا لِمُؤْمِنَةٍ إِذَا قَضَىٰ اللَّهُ وَرَسُولُهُ أَمْرًا أَنْ

يَكُونُوا لَهُمُ الْخِيَرَةُ مِنْ أَمْرِهِمْ. وَمَنْ يَعْصِ اللَّهَ وَرَسُولَهُ فَقَدْ

ضَلَّ ضَلَالًا مُّبِينًا ۝

*It is not fitting for a believer, man or woman, when a matter has been decided by Allah and His messenger, to have any option about their decision: if any one disobeys Allah and His messenger, he is indeed on a clearly wrong path*

(Al-Ahzab: 36)

Think over these *ayaat*, the entire reality will come to light:

1. In the first *ayah* the difference between prophet and common man has been made. It is told why believing the prophet is necessary. The rule of Allah is that he does not tell about His unseen<sup>1</sup> individually to

<sup>1</sup> Unseen (*Ghaib*), those insensible realities without knowing which no method and system of human life can be made. For example what is the truth of a man? Is he free or a servant of someone? Whose servant is he? What is the nature of his relationship with his Lord? Is he accountable to his Lord or not? If accountable, then where, in which way, based on which standard, in which matters and what would be the result of this accounting?

each one. But he reveals it to His selected servant so that others have to believe him.

2. The purpose of belief in *Rasul* is not simply to accept that yes, he is the messenger of Allah, but it is also necessary to obey him. This command to obey not only in this ayah but in every *ayah* of the Quran is general and not conditioned. Nowhere, it has been said that the obedience of *Rasul* is in such and such matters, not in others. Thus we come to know from the Quran that the prophet is a Commander General ---- whatever command he gives is compulsory to be followed by the believers. It is in the jurisdiction of the prophet to keep limited the power of his government according to the instructions of God and allow people freedom of opinion and action outside these limits. But the believers have no right to draw, of their own, the boundary for the jurisdiction of prophet. They are only servants to obey. Had the *Rasul* ordered them to follow a particular way of agriculture, carpentry or smithy, they had to obey him without question.

3. When it was ordered to obey without condition and limit, it also became necessary to make certain that the obedience of the prophet is not the obedience of a man like them, as the ignorant pagans used to think. They said that:

هَلْ هَذَا إِلَّا بَشَرٌ مِّثْلُكُمْ

*Is this (one) more than a man like yourselves? (Al-Anbiya: 3)*

مَا هَذَا إِلَّا بَشَرٌ مِّثْلُكُمْ يُرِيدُ أَنْ يَتَفَضَّلَ عَلَيْكُمْ ۝

*He is no more than a man like yourselves: his wish is to assert his superiority (23: 24)*

---

So long as there is no certain (not based on opinion and guess) answer of these questions, no scheme for human life can be made. And this is the knowledge that Allah calls as unseen (*ghaib*) in this *ayah* of His Holy Book.

وَلَئِنْ أَطَعْتُمْ بَشَرًا مِثْلَكُمْ إِنَّكُمْ إِذَا لَخَسِرُونَ ۝

*If you obey a man like yourselves, behold, it is certain you will be lost (23: 34)*

But it is the obedience of god because whatever a prophet says is from God. His actions are according to the instructions of God. He says nothing out of his own wish but follows revelation. Therefore, you should keep confidence that there is no danger of losing the way and direction.

The same thing has been said in third, fourth and fifth *ayah*. What has been called *wahi* (وحى) in fourth and fifth *ayah* is often considered as the Book of Allah and it said that no revelation comes to prophet other than the Book. But this view is totally wrong. It is proven from the Quran that not only the Book was revealed to the prophets but Allah always instructed them and they walked rightly under those instructions, developed strong opinions and employed strategies. See for example: *Hadrat* Noah makes a boat to protect from the storm just according to the instructions revealed to him by God.

وَاصْنَعِ الْفُلْكَ بِأَعْيُنِنَا وَوَحْيِنَا

*Construct an ark under our eyes (Hud: 37)*

*Hadrat* Abraham is shown the kingdom of the earth and the sky, and also that how dead things are given life. Joseph is taught interpretations of dreams.

ذَٰلِكُمَا مِمَّا عَلَّمَنِي رَبِّي

*That is a part my Lord has taught me (Yusuf: 37)*

Conversations go on with Moses on the mountain of *Toor*. It is asked, what is there in your hand. He says it is my staff, I graze goats with it. It is said to him to throw it. When the rod becomes a snake and Moses runs out of fears, it is said:

يَا مُوسَى أَقْبِلْ وَلَا تَخَفْ إِنَّكَ مِنَ الْآمِنِينَ

*O, Moses! Draw near, and fear not: for you are of those who are secure* (Al-Qasas: 31)

إِذْهَبْ إِلَىٰ فِرْعَوْنَ إِنَّهُ طَغَىٰ

*Go you to Pharaoh for he has indeed transgressed all bounds* (Taha: 24)

Hadrat Moses asks for Aaron as a helping hand which is requested. But both the brother feel fear they are told:

لَا تَخَافَا إِنِّي مَعَكُمَا أَسْمَعُ وَأَرَىٰ

*Fear not: for I am with you: I hear and see* (Taha: 46)

When Moses fears after seeing the snakes, Allah says:

لَا تَخَفْ إِنَّكَ أَنْتَ الْأَعْلَىٰ

*Fear not! You have indeed the upper hand* (Taha: 68)

When the work on Pharaoh completes Moses is said to travel in night

أَسْرِ بِعِبَادِي إِنَّكُمْ مُّتَّبِعُونَ

*Travel by night with my servants; for surely you shall be pursued* (Al-Shoara: 52)

When he reaches the river, the command comes as follows:

إِضْرِبْ بِعَصَاكَ الْبَحْرَ

*Strike the sea with your rod* (Al-Shoara: 63)

Was any one of these revelations in the form of Book for a general guidance of people? All these examples provide ample proof of the fact that Allah keeps an eye on the prophets and guides them through revelation in all those situations where there is a possibility of committing mistake due to human weakness and this revelation is in addition to the revelation for general guidance of people sent through them and written in the Book so that this may serve as a guidance of God and code of conduct.

Similar unreadable and hidden revelation was sent to the last prophet (SAW) also, the hints to which are various in the Quran. The prophet (SAW) first made *Bait al-Muqaddas*, the *Qibla*. There was no command to this in the Book of God. But at the time of making *Bait al-Haram*, the *Qibla* in place of *Bait al-Muqaddas* it was said:

وَمَا جَعَلْنَا الْقِبْلَةَ الَّتِي كُنْتَ عَلَيْهَا إِلَّا لِنَعْلَمَ مَنْ يَتَّبِعَ  
الرَّسُولَ مِمَّنْ يَنْقَلِبُ عَلَى عَقْبَيْهِ -

*And We appointed the Qibla to which thou wast used, only to test those who followed the messenger from those who would turn on their heels (Al-Baqarah: 143)*

This shows that the first appointed *Qibla* i.e. *Bait al-Muqaddas* was based on revelation. At the time of the battle of Uhad the prophet (SAW) said to Muslims that Allah will send angels for your help. Afterwards Allah recalled his words in the Quran as follows:

وَمَا جَعَلَهُ اللَّهُ إِلَّا بُشْرَىٰ لَكُمْ.

*Allah made it for you but a message of hope*

*(Aal-e-Imran: 126)*

This shows that the promise was from God. The prophet (SAW) commanded Muslims after the battle of Uhad to go for the second battle of Badr. This command is nowhere in the Quran. But God confirmed afterward that this was also from God.

الَّذِينَ اسْتَجَابُوا لِلَّهِ وَالرَّسُولِ مِنْ بَعْدِ مَا أَصَابَهُمُ الْقَرْحُ ۝

*Of those who answered the call of Allah and the messenger even after being wounded (Aal-e-Imran: 172)*

God recalled the coming out of Madina at the time of Badr in the following words:

كَمَا أَخْرَجَكَ رَبُّكَ مِنْ بَيْتِكَ ۝

*Just as your Lord ordered you out of your house*

*(Al-Anfal: 5)*



There is no command in the Quran to come out of the house. But afterwards, God confirmed that it was because of Allah's order, not out of personal opinion. Moreover, just at the occasion of battle Allah showed a dream to His messenger:

إِذْ يُرِيكَهُمُ اللَّهُ فِي مَنَامِكَ قَلِيلًا

*Remember in your dream Allah showed them to you as few* (Al-Anfal: 43)

When hypocrite showed belligerence on distribution of alms by the prophet (SAW) Allah ta'ala expressed truth that the distribution was from the order of God:

وَلَوْ أَنَّهُمْ رَضُوا مَا آتَاهُمُ اللَّهُ وَرَسُولُهُ

*If only they had been content with what Allah and his messenger gave them* (Al-taubah: 59)

At the time of the treaty of Hudaibiya, all the companions disagreed and conditions of treaty seemed unacceptable to each of them. But the prophet accepted the conditions and Allah confirmed afterwards that the treaty was from His side.

إِنَّا فَتَحْنَا لَكَ فَتْحًا مُبِينًا

*Verily We have granted you a manifest victory* (Al-Fatah: 1)

Many other *ayaat* may also be found on search, but here complete list is not required. The only thing to prove is that the relationship of God with His messengers is not temporary and temporal, so that it establishes only when some message is to be given and afterwards it breaks. But in fact He keeps special contact with the one whom He chooses as a messenger and permanently guides him through revelation so that he may walk straight and correct in his life and may not commit to speak or act against the pleasure of God. What has been expressed in the beginning *ayaat* of *surah al-Najm*, is in fact the same truth. And as I have discussed in the beginning of this essay, the Quran has specifically and explicitly told the

fact that the prophets are always under vigilance and prevented from mistake. If they err as a human being, or mistake in understanding the subtle hint of 'hidden revelation' (*wahi-e-khafi* i.e. inspiration), or deflect from the implicit objective of God even equal to a hair, He corrects them at once and brings to right path. Whatever has been said in the Quran about the errors of the prophet Muhammad (SAW) or other prophets and objections of God on them, never mean that people's confidence in prophets should shake and they should begin to understand that how the prophets could be obeyed and how his way can be followed with confidence if they themselves (God save us) could commit to error? The true purpose of this information is to tell that Allah has not left them free to follow their lust, opinion or human inferences. As they have been appointed to guide Allah's servants they have been made responsible always to follow his guidance and act not against the will of God in tiniest matter of their life. This is the only cause that the prophet (SAW) has been objected even in such matters which have otherwise no importance in life. For example, a man's using honey or not, not attending to a blind and appearance of wrinkles on face because of his interference, or praying for any person, ----- what importance such events have in one's life? But Allah did not let his messenger follow his opinion or other's wishes even in such little matters. Similarly, giving exemption to anyone from joining war, freeing certain prisoners after taking some money; all these matters are very ordinary events in the life of a commander, but in the life of a prophet the same events become so important that he is objected by the readable revelation (*Wahi-e-jali* i.e. The Quran). Why? It is because that the position of a prophet is not like ordinary commanders so that he is free to work

according to his inference (*ijtihad*), but his *ijtihad* should also be just according to the intention of Allah simply because he is on the post of a prophet. Allah ta'ala considers necessary to interfere and correct the prophet through the readable revelation if he commits to error in the interpretation (*Ijtihad*) of hidden revelation. If he commits to mistake because of not understanding the hint of hidden revelation and deflects from the intention of God even equal to a hair, God considers necessary to correct him through the readable revelation.

4. Allah has described this attribute of prophet to us so that we may have complete confidence on his being on the right way and have a strong belief that every word and act of the prophet is totally free from wrong direction and completely protected from lust and mistakes of human opinions and viewpoints. His step in the way of life is strongly established on the right path exactly taught by God and his pure character is a standard model of Islamic personality without least defect. And Allah has created this model especially complete and perfect so that whoever likes to become His beloved and favourite follow him without hesitation. This purpose has been described in sixth and seventh *ayah*. Sixth *ayah* says: "There is a nice model for you in the prophet of God". Seventh *ayah* tells that the only way of seeking favour of God is to obey the prophet (SAW).

Again, we do not find here any special terms or conditions; there is clear generality and wide scope. The prophet in person has been presented as model without any condition and instructions for his unqualified obedience have been given. It means that the more you will obey him and the more you will colour yourself according to his holy character, nearer you will become in presence of Allah and the more He will love you.

But making the prophet a model and instruction to obey him does not mean that whatever he has done in his life, every man should do exactly the same work in the same way and imitate him in his life in such a way that there may be no difference in the original and the copy. This is neither the aim of the Quran nor it can be. In fact this is a general instruction; we can find correct way of following it in the teachings of the prophet (SAW) himself and also in the activities of his companions (RA). Here is no need of its details. I may tell in general that in the matters related to duties, obligations, and the pillars of Islam we should follow the prophet's words and actions step to step. For example in the matters of prayer, fasting, pilgrimage, *zakat* and purity etc. exact following of prophet's (SAW) instructions is necessary. As for the matters related to general instructions of Islamic life e.g. civilization, economic, political matters and details of social interactions, there may be two situations. Either there are some positive or negative instructions of the prophet (SAW) about things, or there are some teachings in the light of which we can know which of the way or method suits more to the spirit of Islam. Thus a man who wants with good intention to obey him and study his *sunnah* with the same purpose there is not the least difficulty to know in what matters one should follow the prophet step to step and in what matters general principles of moral, wisdom, welfare and virtue should be derived from *sunnah*. But those who by nature like contradictions present arguments in different ways. They say the prophet (SAW) spoke Arabic; should we also speak Arabic? He married with Arab women; should we also marry with Arab women? He was used to particular type of dress and diet; should we also do the same? He had a particular pattern of social interaction; should we exactly imitate the

same? Would that, they had thought that the basic thing is not the language he used, but are those moral limits which he always abided by in his speech. The real problem is not that one should marry an Arab woman or non Arab, it is how should we behave with her, how to keep her rights and how to use one's allowed *shar'i* authority in dealing with her. Which model for a Muslim's family life can be better than the behaviour of the prophet (SAW) with his noble wives? Moreover, who told that the type of dress used by the prophet (SAW) was the only *shar'i* dress? And every Muslim should take exactly the same type of food, the prophet (SAW) used to take. In fact it is those limits and principles of piety and purity to be obeyed which he kept in view related to his diet and dress. We can know through these limits how to act according to the lesson of the Quran balanced between *ruhbaniiyya* and lust so that neither the pure things are unnecessarily refrained nor there is extravagance. The same is true about all other private and personal matters of prophet's life. That holy life was entirely a standard model of a true and God loving Muslim. *Hadrat* Ayesha told the truth that his moral was the Quran. If anybody wants to know about how a Muslim should pass his life according to the teachings and spirit of Islam, he should see the life of the prophet. The Islam that is encoded in the Quran will be found detailed in the life of Allah's prophet (SAW).

Thanks God, our friend Chaudhry Ghulam Ahmad is not one of them, but because of some of the prophet's sayings he has fallen in doubt that "His Excellency (SAW) was not a messenger in all terms and conditions and his every word and action was not in the capacity of a prophet". The misunderstanding caused by the sayings of prophet in fact point to another reality. Fact is that the prophet (SAW) was a prophet in every condition and it

was his prophet hood which he always kept in mind for which he was sent. He was not sent to curtail the personal opinion of people and withheld their mind and thought. Nor did he come to teach world the methods of agriculture, arts and industry. Also he was not sent to guide people in their modes of earning and personal matters. The purpose of his life was only one. That was to settle Islam in hearts as a doctrine and establish it in the character of individuals and system of the society. His Excellency did not concentrate on any matter other than this. And if by chance he spoke in other matters he clearly told that you are free in your opinion and action, you know better about your worldly matters. Even though his companions were always ready to follow him as a messenger in every matter and always considered him commander to be followed so far so that sometimes they felt even about his worldly sayings to be belonging to the category of prophesy, yet he never compelled them to obey him in such matters. During the period of 23 years he never forgot his mission even for a while and every time kept in mind which of the matter belongs to this mission and which does not, never ordered his followers obey in unrelated matters despite having full authority on them; all this is witness to the fact that prophecy did never separate from His Excellency. But it is not correct to think that whatever he said about the matters of world was not from the revelation of God. Though his sayings of this category are not orders, nor did he say them in commanding language, also, nobody considered them so, yet each word of his was truth without any tint of mistake. For example whatever he said about medicine is wonderfully packed with wisdom; how an unlettered Arab who was not a physician, never researched in medicine, reached such realities of the subject which are now being

investigated after centuries of research. We find hundreds of such examples in the wise sayings of His Excellency. Though, according to your words, these things are not related to the duty of prophet hood (*tableegh-e-risaalat*), but those extraordinary powers which Allah settles in the instincts of his prophet, not only help in this duty but also show distinctive features in every matter. How smithy or manufacture of armor could be related to prophet hood? But *Hadrat* David shows perfection in this art and Allah says that he himself taught him the skill.

وَعَلَّمْنَاهُ صَنْعَةَ لَبُوسٍ لَّكُمْ لِيُحْصِنَكُمْ مِنْ بَأْسِكُمْ

*It was we Who taught him the making of coats of mail for your benefit, to guard you from each other's violence.*

(Hud: 80)

What relation does the knowledge of bird's speech has with *Risalat* (prophet hood)? But *Hadrat* Solomon expresses his perfection in it and says, "We have been taught the speech of birds" (27: 16). Which department of *Risalat* is related to smithy and construction of boat? Yet Allah does not say to Noah to construct a strong boat but He says as follows

وَاصْنَعِ الْفُلْكَ بِأَعْيُنِنَا وَوَحْيِنَا.

*Construct an Ark under our eye and our inspiration*

(Hud: 37)

Thus it is not correct to think about messengers that only those matters were revealed to them which were related directly to the office of prophet hood. In fact their entire life was according to the guidance of The Real One (حق تعالیٰ). However, the difference is that in their life there is an aspect in which to follow them step to step is an avoidable condition for being a Muslim, while there is another aspect in which this type of following is not necessary. But a man who wants to become nearer to God and that God should love him has no way other than to

follow the *sunnah* of *Rasul* so far so that deflection from it even equal to a hair will bring him as far from being His beloved as more is the deflection. It is because there is no way other than obedience and following for being beloved.

فَاتَّبِعُونِي يُحْبِبْكُمُ اللَّهُ

*Follow me: Allah will love you* (Aal-e-Imran: 31)

5. What is the difference between the command of a messenger and that of a common man and how grand is the dissimilarity between the decree of a messenger and ordinary person becomes self evident after this discussion. However, I have presented three *ayaat* in the last on the basis of which the distinction becomes well defined and explicit. These *ayaat* prove that bowing head to the order of the prophet (SAW) and accepting his judgment is the part and necessary condition of faith; one who denies it is not a believer. Does it apply to any other commander or judge? If not, then what a great mistake is to say that "Wherever the words Allah and *Rasul* have come together in the Quran, they mean the command (أمرت)". I have objection to these words of Maulana Aslam Jairajpury and I consider them totally against the teachings of the Quran. As for the problem presented by Mr. Chaudhry, that is quite different, and I completely agree to it. I agree to the fact that the obedience of commander after the prophet (SAW) is compulsory. And the commanders will deal all the matters of Islamic government as they were governed by the prophet (SAW) in his life. And the judgment of the commander will be the final judgment. So far so that if anybody considers, in his view, the judgment of the commander against the command of God and the prophet, it will be obligatory for him to some extent to accept it even if keeps firm on his opinion. But it will never mean that the command is



exactly the same thing that is called in the Quran and “Allah and *Rasul*”, and the orders of the commander are exactly as the orders of Allah and *Rasul*. If it was so, then in case of misguidance and repulsion of commanders from the Book and the *Sunnah*, there would be no way out except to obey them and walk on the ways of distortion. If any servant of God stands in these situations and directs towards Allah and the prophet, then according to the judgment (فتوي) of Maulana Aslam the commanders will have a right to declare him as traitor and kill him. They will also have right to say that we are “Allah and *Rasul*”; who else is there to whom you want us to refer to?

**Tarjumanul Quran: Rabiuthani, 1353 A.H; July, 1935 C.E.**

## ***Hadith* and the Quran: A Critical Appraisal of the Refuters of *Hadith***

A man has presently written an essay entitled as "Why I Became a Refuter of *Hadith*"<sup>1</sup>. The writer has not told his name but has used the title "Truth teller" (حق گو). A more detailed essay of the same Mr. "Truth teller" entitled as "Study of *Hadith*" (مطالعہ حدیث) also has been published in journals some of the parts of which we have seen. The arguments are more or less same as are generally presented by the refuters of *Hadith*. All of them say in short that the Quran is enough for us, *hadith* narrations are not dependable, and laying foundation of religion on them is not correct. In view of Mr. Truth Teller and the refuters of *hadith* like him there is not the least benefit of *hadith* to Islam but in contrast it has provided the enemies of Islam those weapons which they use to attack it. Therefore, they want that the *hadith* should be completely withdrawn from religion and consider it a great service to Islam.

Mr. Truth Teller has presented various witnesses from the books of *hadith* to prove how the enemies of Islam find material to attack Islam and prophet hood of *Rasul*. For example some *hadiths* prove occurrence of changes in the Quran, some of them seem supporting the view that revelation was a deceit, whatever the prophet listened from the people of the books presented as revelation (God save us). Some of them tell that revelation descended on the prophet according to his wishes. Some of them witness that magic used to influence the *Rasul*. Some of them point to that the *Rasul* used to kill his

---

<sup>1</sup> Published by "Daftar-e-Ummat-e-Muslimah", Amritsar.

opponents by hidden methods (event of Ka'b bin Ashraf). Some of them seem to accuse him of tyranny and mercilessness (killing of the people of 'Uraina). Some of them point to that the *Rasul* was a man of lust. In the same sequence the writer has also applied Sharda Act on *Rasulullah* (SAW) and has charged all those traditions undependable which tell about the marriage of the Mother of Believers, *Hadrat Ayisha Siddiqa* (RA) at the age of 9 years. After that the writer has raised objections to the science of *hadith* in general. In his view the publication of *hadith* was prohibited in the period of rightly guided caliphs (خلفاء راشدين). Narration of *hadiths* began in Umayyad and Abbasid periods and *hadiths* were created to fulfill the political objectives of kings. *Imam Hasan Basari*, *Imam Zahri*, *Imam Malik*, the writers of all the six correct books of *hadith* and all other people who have collected the *hadith* literature were according to the writer the creators of false traditions and thus all of them distorted the image of Islam. In addition to political objectives beliefs of Jews, Christianity, Zoroaster and other religions and baseless things entered it. According to the writer five times prayers, 30 days fasting, concept of bridge and balance, instructions about slaughter, interference of religion in eating and drinking things, circumcision, sacrifice, rules of cleanliness, prohibition of images and idols, stories about ascent and many such things the narrators took from others and made them a part of Islam by relating with the *Rasul*.

Leaders of *Fiqh* are also to be blamed in the sight of the writer because they took the concept of *shari'ah* from Jews and adhered to the forehead of Islam, made religion cover all the matters of life, made those rules religious by referring them to the prophet, which were made to suit the climate of Iraq and the conditions of first and second

centuries. Thus Islam limited by "National *Shari'ah*" could remain capable of introduction in other nations who could follow it. In view of the writer the opinion of Saint Paul and his followers to separate religion (belief system) from *shari'ah* (code of life) was right and the same thing became the cause of the spread of Christianity in the world. Mohammad *Rasulullah* (SAW) himself was sent in view of the writer to cut the chains of *shari'ah* and to free the matters of life from the limitations of religion. Following ayah has been presented as argument in favour:

وَيَضَعُ عَنْهُمْ إِصْرَهُمْ وَالْأَغْلَالَ الَّتِي كَانَتْ عَلَيْهِمْ

*He releases them from their heavy burdens and from the yokes that are upon them.* (Al-Araf: 157)

According to the writer in this *ayah*, shackles (اغلال) refer to the "shackles of *shari'ah*" and he says that the Imams of *fiqh* and *hadith* tied Muslims in the same shackles of *shari'ah* which the prophet was sent to cut and began narrating *hadith* and "making *shari'ah*". In the opinion of the writer all this was done because these people wanted like the scholars of Jews to keep control over Muslims and for this they made a bad use of the name of *Rasulullah* (SAW).

Then the tasteful aspect is that he has laid his viewpoints on historical arguments even though if the *hadiths* are not dependable the history is even more undependable. Although in *hadiths* there is a continuous chain of narrators from *Rasulullah* to the companions and the *Imams*, however doubtful may it be for you. But in contrast, the history is not even certified. The books of history which we consider most authentic, we have no proof about them that they were actually written by those who are considered their authors. Similarly the material presented in them is not authenticated so that we may fully trust them. Thus if the continuous and authenticated

tradition of *hadiths* can be so easily doubted, the whole material of history can be even more easily refuted. A man can say without hesitation that there was no existence of Abbasids; Omayyad's kingdom had never come into existence. Alexander is only a legend. Thus the events of history can be refuted on the basis of far more stronger arguments than the basis on which you falsify the literature of *hadith*. It is because the collection of past events is not as strong as that of *hadiths*, and if it is not dependable then all the narrations about old events are more likely to be drowned in river. It is astonishing that a person who denies the traditions of *hadith* and who considers possible that even the Muslims of such great names that no greater persons out of Muslim nation can be presented from the period nearest to the prophet (SAW) despite their claim of Islam could speak lie about the prophet and could relate *hadiths* to him while they have composed them of their own; how does he trust history? Why does he not say that Tabri, Ibn Atheer, Ibn Khaldun and all the books of history are subjective, these are stories and nothing of past is available to us correct and pure? Most cruel thing is that a man who considers trustless persons like Bukhari, Muslim, Abu Dauood, even Imam Malik, Imam Abu Hanifa, Imam Shafi'i and Imam Hasan Basari does not hesitate in referring to Phone Creamer as a certificate. It tells from where to where obstinacy pushes down a man?

If an unknowing Muslim or a non Muslim reads the essay of Mr. "Truth Teller" his heart will surely take the impression that the Muslims rebelled against the prophet (SAW) within 50 years of his death and the same people leaded this rebellion who were prominent in the history of Islam and are considered to be the pillars of religion while there was not a tint of belief in their hearts. They for their

own purposes created splendid words like *hadith*, *fiqh*, *sunnah* and *shari'ah* and to deceive people related those things to the prophet (SAW) which were against his teachings and the teachings of the Quran. We do not expect that after receiving this impression any person will believe in the truth of Islam, because if the Imams and the famous preacher of this religion are so characterized, which wise person will trust that a religion having followers like Mr. "Truth Teller" and few like-minded people can also be true? Not only this, but looking at such kind of objections a person may even doubt if Islam is present in its real form today or not? It is because if among the seniors of Muslims from the very early period of first century to the present time no group has ever been present to correctly protect the events, words and teachings of the prophet (SAW), and when the young and old all were trustless to say anything in the name of the prophet, then nothing of Islam can be trusted; even the ascent of a prophet in Arab cannot be believed. What, if the story of a *Rasul* and *Risalat* would have been plotted to have grip on people. Similarly, doubt may be raised about the Quran also, whether it actually descended to a messenger or not, if it descended whether its original text is protected because the source of it is the same people who ashamed not the least in borrowing things from Jews and Christians and then relating them to the prophet, or they are those people before whom all this happened and they did not dare even to speak. Mr. "Truth Teller" and his like-minded refuters of *hadith* have provided the enemies of Islam an instrument which is million degrees more dangerous than the instruments provided by *hadith*; foundations of Islam may be dug out through it.

It seems Mr. "Truth Teller" has looked at the books of *hadith* only with the aim of investigating defects, and

after closing eyes toward their uncountable beauties he has killed most of his time in searching things which were useful according to his viewpoint in raising questions against *hadith*. We can say with confidence if they had seen the Quran with the same defective tilt of search he would have seen it also full of defects. What else is the cause that thousands of unbelievers study the Quran and instead of getting guidance go even more astray? Is it not that they do not study the Quran in search of guidance, but they search defects and read it to obtain weapons against Islam. That is why they do not find in the Quran anything but defects, because man finds everywhere what he likes. Therefore, we thank God that the eyes of Mr. "Truth Teller" did not wear defect searching spectacles during the study of the Quran. Otherwise, he would have seen that this book also has provided many weapons to the enemies of Islam, and it would have tilted him to refute the Quran also as he refuted *hadith* by seeing weapons in the hands of the enemies of Islam as provided to them by *hadith*.

Whatever objections Mr. "Truth Teller" has raised against *hadith* can be answered word by word, but we do not want to entangle with minute details, instead we want to discuss some principal things which are actually the focus of discussion. Although, in view of the defect searching habit of the person under discussion and the *hadith* refuters in general we hope little about their correction but our view is that their misguidance in fact begins with good intention and only the lack of knowledge brings them to wrong paths. Therefore we expect that if they thought on our arguments keeping their minds for the time being free from falsifying tilt their belief will be corrected.

First of all this point has to be kept in mind why Allah *Ta'ala* sent the Quran and other heavenly books through prophets? Had He no power of sending the books all of a sudden in written form to each of the person of humankind? If He had not, he was powerless, then why one should consider Him God? If He had power, and surely He had, then why He did not chose this way for conveying his message? Obviously it would have been a sure of guidance, after seeing this miracle and against the habit even everybody would have accepted that the guidance has come from God. But Allah did not do this and always sent guidance through messengers. Moreover, he did not employ angels or any other non human creature for this service and always utilized the services of man. Though the non believers in every period said if Allah wants to send his guidance why does He not send angels to us so that we also might believe that it is from God? But Allah responded to each of this type of question, 'had We sent angels We would have sent them in the guise of man'.

وَلَوْ جَعَلْنَاهُ مَلَكًا لَجَعَلْنَاهُ رَجُلًا

*If We had made it an angel, We should have sent him as a man*

(Al-Anam: 9)

And also that, 'If angels dwelt on the land We would have sent angels for their guidance.

لَوْ كَانَ فِي الْأَرْضِ مَلَائِكَةٌ يَمْشُونَ مُطْمَئِنِّينَ لَنَزَّلْنَا عَلَيْهِمْ  
مِّنَ السَّمَاءِ مَلَكًا رَسُولًا

*Say, "If there were settled, on earth, angels walking about in peace and quiet, We should certainly have sent them down from the heavens an angel for a messenger."*

(Bani Israil: 95)

The question is, "why so much importance was laid to send messengers and to make only men out of His servants, as messengers for sending the books. The words



of God i.e. the Quran itself answer it well. It tells us that Allah has sent all messengers to give command according to the instructions of God and people obey their commands. They pass life in accordance to the laws of God and people observe and follow their model.

وَمَا أَرْسَلْنَا مِنْ رَّسُولٍ إِلَّا لِيُطَاعَ بِإِذْنِ اللَّهِ

*We sent not a messenger, but to be obeyed, in accordance with the will of Allah* (Al-Nisa: 64)

The messenger (AS) came one after the other and each one of them demanded that the people should fear God and obey me.

اتَّقُوا اللَّهَ وَأَطِيعُوا

*So fear Allah, and obey Me* (Al-Shoara': 108, 136, 144, 150, 163, and 179)

It was asked through the tongue of the last prophet:

إِنْ كُنْتُمْ تُحِبُّونَ اللَّهَ فَاتَّبِعُونِي يُحْبِبْكُمُ اللَّهُ

*If ye do love Allah, Follow me: Allah will love you* (Al-e-Imran: 31)

It was recommended to the believers:

لَقَدْ كَانَ لَكُمْ فِي رَسُولِ اللَّهِ أُسْوَةٌ حَسَنَةٌ

*Ye have indeed in the Messenger of Allah a beautiful pattern of conduct* (Al-Ahzab: 21)

If only the book was sent, people would have made great differences in understanding it and there would have been none to decide between them. People would have mistaken in understanding the correct meaning of command and there would have been none to correct them. This requirement could, however, be met with the angels, but for the instructions about purity, cleanliness and piety, people would have thought that man cannot follow these instructions in practical life. The angel is free from human sentiments; he has no stomach, lust and human requirements. It is not difficult for him to pass a

pious life. But how can we imitate him despite having human weaknesses? Therefore, it was necessary that a man would have come on land with all human sentiments, tilts, powers and limitations and demonstrated that a man can pass life and act according to the instructions of God. All those conditions would have been presented to him as are presented to a man in general. He would have participated practically in all matters of life, instructed them on every step through his words and actions, trained and showed them how on the zigzag ways of life one could protect himself and walk straight on the way of truth and virtue. That is why God Himself did not consider enough to give only the book and made mandatory to obey the *Rasul* and follow his best model.

The Quran has recommended in clear words to follow three authorities; command of God, order of the prophet and instructions of governors.

أَطِيعُوا اللَّهَ وَأَطِيعُوا الرَّسُولَ وَأُولِيَ الْأَمْرِ مِنْكُمْ

*Obey Allah, and obey the Messenger, and those charged with authority among you* (Al-Nisa: 59)

If it was enough to obey the Quran alone and following anything else was not required, the obedience of the prophet and the governors (أُولِيَ الْأَمْرِ) would have not been recommended. If the command of the prophet and governors was not other than the commands of the Quran, it was meaningless to give separately the instruction to follow both of them. Separate instruction to follow all the three is clearly telling that in addition to the instructions of God given in the Quran, the instructions of the prophets are also to be followed and their obedience is just like the obedience of God.

مَنْ يُطِيعِ الرَّسُولَ فَقَدْ أَطَاعَ اللَّهَ

*He who obeys the Messenger, obeys Allah* (Al-Nisa: 80)

Moreover, the obedience of the governors of Muslims is also mandatory provided that they are in concurrence with the commands of God and prophet (SAW). In case of the difference of opinion it is necessary to refer back to the instructions of God and prophet (SAW).

فَإِنْ تَنَازَعْتُمْ فِي شَيْءٍ فَرُدُّوهُ إِلَى اللَّهِ وَالرَّسُولِ

*If ye differ in anything among yourselves, refer it to Allah and His Messenger* (Al-Nisa: 59)

This tells that the book of God alone is not enough, the relationship of prophet hood with it is unbreakable, and obedience of prophet's commands and following his model is as necessary as is the obedience of the commands of God's book. One who says that we shall take the book of God alone and not the command and the model of the prophet, he breaks his relation with prophet hood, he cuts that association which God has established between his servants and the book as a necessary contact. He says as if the book of God was enough for His servants but He committed to an unnecessary act by sending the book through His messenger.

سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى عَمَّا يَقُولُونَ.

After the necessary relation between the book of God and the *sunnah* of *Rasul* is proven, it is important to think on the question whether the obedience of the commands of *Rasul* and following of his good model was necessary only up to his physical life? Is it not needed after him? If it is so it would mean that the prophet hood of the prophet (SAW) was limited to the period of his biological life. As soon as he died the connection of his prophet hood was practically cut from the world. The office of prophet hood in this situation becomes meaningless. If the responsibility of *Rasul* was only that of giving us the Book of God like a deliverer of the letter

and nothing more than this we shall repeat that in this situation there was in fact no need of sending a *Rasul*. An angel might have done this duty. But it could have also been done directly without an agent. But if something more than the delivery is needed, and for the same, the commands of obedience were given, and if for the guidance of man the instructions of prophet and the sample of his character was also needed, then what means it's all being only for 23 or 24 years? Sending a *Rasul* only for one quarter of a century and establishing such a great office of prophet hood only for this little period, and so enthusiastically characterizing as the source of guidance, something to be finished as soon as the prophet leaves this physical life; all seems to be the game of a child which is never justifiable to the glory of an intelligent and wise God.

Allah *Ta'ala* has himself removed this blame. He says to Muhammad (SAW) as follows

وَمَا أَرْسَلْنَاكَ إِلَّا رَحْمَةً لِّلْعَالَمِينَ

*We sent thee not, but as a Mercy for all creatures*

(Al-Ambiya: 107)

It is obvious if the grace of prophet hood was limited to his period he would not have been said to be a mercy for all creatures. If it was said, "you have brought the Quran which is forever, therefore, you are a mercy for all creatures", then it would mean that not he but the Quran is a mercy and he was called mercy in vain. But Allah *Ta'ala* has separately called both the Quran and its carrier as mercy. Moreover, it has also been said that:

وَمَا أَرْسَلْنَاكَ إِلَّا كَافَّةً لِّلنَّاسِ بَشِيرًا وَنَذِيرًا وَلَكِنَّ أَكْثَرَ

النَّاسِ لَا يَعْلَمُونَ

*We have not sent thee but as a universal (Messenger) to men, giving them glad tidings, and warning them (against sin), but most men understand not* (Saba: 28)

This *ayah* clearly indicates that he is the prophet of God from the time of declaration of prophet hood till dooms day towards those who are known as human being (الناس). His prophet hood is not confined to his period but it is established so long as the human beings live on the face of earth. The *ayah* has no contextual hint that human being (الناس) should be limited to his period. Nor there is subtlest hint that human beings are confined to any future time period. On the contrary, the other *ayaat* support the explanation that the prophet hood of His Excellency is permanent forever. Allah *Ta'ala* has completed religion (دين) through him.

الْيَوْمَ أَكْمَلْتُ لَكُمْ دِينَكُمْ وَأَتِمَمْتُ عَلَيْكُمْ نِعْمَتِي

*This day have I perfected your religion for you, completed My favour upon you* (Al-maidah: 3)

The chain of prophet hood has been closed after His Majesty (SAW)

مَا كَانَ مُحَمَّدٌ أَبَا أَحَدٍ مِّن رِّجَالِكُمْ وَلَكِن رَّسُولَ اللَّهِ  
وَخَاتَمَ النَّبِيِّينَ وَكَانَ اللَّهُ بِكُلِّ شَيْءٍ عَلِيمًا.

*Muhammad is not the father of any of your men, but (he is) the Messenger of Allah, and the Seal of the Prophets: and Allah has full knowledge of all things.* (Al-Ahzab: 40)

And in contrast to the books sent to other prophets, the book sent to him has been protected forever, because other books were for the guidance of a particular period while the Quran is forever.

وَأَنَّا لَهُ لَحَافِظُونَ.

*We have, without doubt, sent down the Message; and we will assuredly guard it* (Al-Hijr: 9)

It proves that the prophet hood of the respected Rasool (SAW) is forever. And if it is so then all those commands are also forever which make necessary the obedience of the commands of *Rsulullah*, which tell that his life is a role model, explain his obedience as the cause

of pleasing God and through which the guidance has been associated his following:

وَأِنْ تَطِيعُوا تُهْتَدُوا

*If ye obey him, ye shall be on right guidance (Al-noor: 54)*

Need of pleasing God and receiving guidance is the need of present people and the people to come till the last day as it was the need of the people of the prophet's time. Thus if both of these are associated with the obedience of *Rasul* and imitation of his model, it becomes necessary that the clean and pure samples of prophetic character and the holy commands received through his words which represent revelation should also remain together with the Quran which were the source of guidance to the companions of the prophet (SAW). Otherwise the guidance will weaken for the people coming afterward.

I have used very soft words "guidance will weaken" (بدایت ناقص رہ جائے گی). Looking at the unbreakable relation between the revelation of books and prophet hood, and keeping in mind the permanent *sunnah* of Allah in this connection, I should have said, "Were the role model of the prophet and his commands not protected, was the holy springhead of guidance present in the character of the prophet closed, the guidance of the world was not possible by the book of God alone. It is because protection of the book of God after the expiry of the signs of prophet hood is just like sending the book without a prophet. If after the revelation of book there is no need of the signs of prophet hood, there is no need of prophet hood for descending the book. This is an open sarcasm against the wisdom of God. If prophet hood is necessary with revelation, then surely with it the protection of the signs of prophet hood is also necessary. The book of God alone without the signs of prophet hood cannot serve the purpose of direction. You can easily understand its cause.

Had the signs of prophet hood lost, the end of Muslims also had been like those nations which have nothing with them except legends and stories. People would have said, first of all tell about the life of the person to whom according to you this book was sent so that we could judge whether he was able to be the prophet of God or not? But we could have told them nothing. People would have asked if you have any external witness favouring the claim of the Quran that could prove your prophet was in fact a prophet? But we could not present any witness. We ourselves could not know when and in what conditions the Quran was revealed, how after observing the personality of our prophet and his holy life people entered the fold of Islam in large numbers, how he cleansed hearts, taught wisdom, spread the light of gnosis by reciting the holy verses of God and how he accomplished the grand programme of bringing to order and to reform all the departments of life and developed the all encompassing and wise system of *shari'ah* which could not have been accomplished by human reason alone? Witness of *hadith* is the only irrefutable proof of the fact that he was really the prophet of Allah. Moreover, if those narrations were not available which according to the refuters of *hadith* are but to be drowned in river, we could not relate the authority of the Quran to the one who brought it. We had no proof of the fact that this Quran or its text is in fact the same as was sent to the prophet (SAW). Our book could find the same status as it is that of *Zind*, *Avista*, *Geeta*, *Vedas* and the books of Buddhism. Similarly all our activities, rules and laws of religious life would also have become unauthentic. We could not tell and know about the methods and form of Prayer, fasting, pilgrimage, alms giving and other religious activities that they are just according to the teachings of the prophet (SAW). Refuters

of *hadith* say that “continuous *sunnah*” (سنة المتواترة) is enough for all these. But what would have been the position of these continuous traditions in absence of written and authenticated narrations except to claim that it has been the habit from old to new, generation after generation? These kinds of continuous traditions are there among Hindus, Buddhists and other nations too. They also claim that the worships we perform and the formalities current among us are continuous as such from our seniors. Whether the world and their own elites do not raise doubts and say, God knows better about the origin of these methods and how they went on changing with time? Is not the comment of tradition worship made on these? If anybody wants to bring about certain addition to these, do they have any other argument against it except to say, there can be no change in whatever the forefathers have been doing. Then, if according to the wishes of the refuters of *hadith* we also did not have such continuous, authentic and written traditions which provide certificate of authenticity of every event that occurred from our period back to the period of prophet (SAW), and if we also had only the “continuous action” which Mr. “Truth Teller” is designating as “Continuous *Sunnah*”, the status of our religious activities and beliefs would have not been different from those methods and superstitions which are found among Hindus and other nations and which are suppose to be the “formalities” and “religious stories”.<sup>1</sup> Think; was it the source of power and strength for Islam or that of weakness and unease?

---

<sup>1</sup> Even among Muslims regular celebrations of anniversaries (عرس), gifts (نیاز) and the formalities of marriage and death could find the status of ‘continuous *sunnah*’ in absence of *hadith*. And after rejecting *hadith*, there is no way of refuting these ‘continuous *sunnahs*’.



It becomes clear from this discussion that the protection of the *sunnah* of *Rasul* with the Book of God is also necessary and unavoidable.

Now concentrate on the question, what is the way in which the *sunnah* of *Rasul* reaches or can reach us? It is quite obvious that after the prophet (SAW) was made prophet till his last breath, the period of about quarter century might have not passed in the recitation of the Quran to people but in addition to it he might have been conveying his religion day and night, advising misguided persons, teaching the believers, training and reforming people through presenting his model of prayers, moral and virtuous deeds. It has been said in the Quran itself:

يَتْلُوا عَلَيْكُمْ آيَاتِنَا وَيُزَكِّيكُمْ وَيُعَلِّمُكُمُ الْكِتَابَ وَالْحِكْمَةَ

مَا لَمْ تَكُونُوا تَعْلَمُونَ ۝

*Rehearsing to you Our Signs, and sanctifying you, and instructing you in Scripture and Wisdom, and in new knowledge.* (Al-Baqarah: 151)

Moreover, it is also known through the Quran that this life of a teacher and preacher passed in such a great business that he did not care least for his comfort; each minute was busy either in prayers or in preaching and advisement, teaching of wisdom or cleansing hearts. So far so that Allah *Ta'ala* had to interrupt and say why do you work so hard? Why do you destroy yourself?

Can anybody say that in this great activity of preaching life, no word worth remembering came out of his tongue except the *ayaat* of the Holy Quran? Did he not do any work worth considering model by people and advising others to imitate this model? The people of faith believed and the Quran also instructed them to believe that his every word is truth:

وَمَا يَنْطِقُ عَنِ الْهَوَىٰ

*Nor does he say (aught) of (his own) Desire (Al-Najm: 3)*

And his every action has to be imitated:

لَقَدْ كَانَ لَكُمْ فِي رَسُولِ اللَّهِ أُسْوَةٌ حَسَنَةٌ

*Ye have indeed in the Messenger of Allah a beautiful pattern (of conduct)* (Al-Ahzab: 21)

Obviously the Muslims equipped with this belief would have surely listened to each word of the prophet (SAW), kept an eye on all of his actions and discussed about them among each other. People carefully watch even the words and activities of those great persons with whom prophet hood and holiness is not associated, and then discuss their sayings and activities. Then, how it was possible that the respected companions would have taken only the Quran from a holy person whom they also considered prophet and a perfect model of Islam, and would have closed eyes and ears from all of his other sayings and actions?

There were no photographic instruments in that period so that all the actions of the prophet (SAW) could be preserved in films. Nor was audio recording possible in those days. News papers were also not published from Makka and Madina to provide daily reports of his preaching activities and dealings of life. The only way of preservation and transaction was the memories and tongues of people. This was the only way of preserving and presenting events to the coming generations not only with Arabs but also with other nations. But the Arabs were especially distinguished in their power of memory and correct narrations; this attribute of them was such that perhaps even the phone creamer of Mr. "Truth Teller" cannot refuse to it. A nation which memorised the history of Arabs (ايام العرب), poetry of ignorant period, genealogy of tribes even that of their camels and horses, it is far beyond reason that she should not have memorise the life events, activities and sayings of the grand personality of

the prophet (SAW) and transferred this treasure not to the coming generations.

Then, it was quite natural that after his demise the interest in his life history would have increased among his lovers. Those who could not meet the prophet (SAW) were naturally inclined to ask about his teachings and life by his companions who had received direct training from him. We ourselves observe that if an old person is available who had lived with a great man of past century, people use to meet and consult him to know about that great man. One of our friends travelled from northern India to Hyderabad in search of an old man who had lived with Saiyyid Jamaluddin Afghani to know about the life of *Saiyyid Sahib* (سید صاحب). If this happens with ordinary people, is it not possible that after the death of the greatest messenger and teacher of the world, people would have become restless to know about his life and take benefit of this knowledge? Are these events of history beyond reason that wherever people got the news of the presence of a companion they rushed to that place, travelled hundreds of miles to meet him and know about the life and teachings of the prophet (SAW)? The same must have been happened with the generation after the companions. Extraordinary interest in listening and transferring *hadith* among Muslims for at least two centuries is certain, and it is not only just according to guess but the history also is the witness to it. Refuters of *hadith* do not make use of even reasonable guess. As for the history, they accept only that part of it which provides material for refusal of *hadith*. All other evidences of history are just unreliable for them. But those in whom obstinacy in favour of *hadith* refutation has not developed will certainly accept at least that the grand personality of the prophet and his glorious prophetic life was not as unworthy of attraction that there

was no zeal among Muslims even for two centuries to collect information about his life and listening to his teachings. Its refusal will mean that *Rasulullah* had no influence of the first generation and those who believed in his prophecy also had no attention towards him. Refuters of *hadith* are free to keep this or even worst opinion about the prophet and people nearest to him. But we understand that not only a Muslim but even a non Muslim scholar of Islamic history and literature will not consider this opinion correct.

There is no doubt that with increasing distance from the period of prophet, external influences began to take entry among Muslims, and mostly those people brought these influences who accepted Islam in Iraq, Iran, Syria and Egypt but viewpoints of ancient religions did not remove from their minds. Also, there is no doubt that a group came into existence among Muslims who compose things by their hearts and referred them to *Rasulullah* only to make their influence on Muslims. Both of these things are proven by history and guess also demands that it must have happened. But is it correct to draw inference that all Muslims were similar? All were liars and faithless? All were such hypocrites that lied about a person for whose prophesy they called witness five times daily? All were such enemies that introduced in religion all types of filth by the name of prophet and slash its roots? This inference can neither be drawn by using reason nor does history support it. When it is not correct, then the true statement will be only that from the last part of first century composed material also began to introduce in the treasure of correct *hadith* literature and that the literature available to coming generations was a mixture of correct, wrong and doubtful *hadiths*.

What was the correct method after this amalgamation of false with the truth? Was it correct to reject in one stroke all that is true and false because of adulteration and to disconnect relation with the prophet (SAW)? Refuters of *hadith* consider it easy, but it was very hard for those who believed in the Quran, considered the prophet as a role model and those who believed that access to guidance was not possible without the obedience of prophet; it was as hard as to jump intentionally and eagerly into fire. As compared to rejecting all they considered easier to dig out mountains and collect gems. They worked hard from dawn to dusk for maintaining their and Muslim's relationship with the prophet, developed rules to judge and evaluate *hadiths*, differentiated the true from the false. On the one hand they refined the *hadiths* according to the rules of narration and on the other hand investigated the life of thousands and *lakhs* of narrators. Then on the third level they criticised *hadiths* based on reason. Thus they collected such a unique treasure about the *sunnah* of *Rasul* that no other equally authentic and reliable collection of this standard is available about the life of any person of the past or present. Refuters of *hadith* are free to wash away all their hard work with one clout of pen. Refuters of *hadith* are free to call these true servants of Islam as inventors of *hadith* (وضّاع حدیث); naturalised in Persia (پروردگان عجم), and gleaners from Omayyad and Abbasid table cloth (زله ریان بنی امیه و بنی عباس)<sup>1</sup>. But the fact is that these scholars have done such great act of kindness for Muslims that they will always remain indebted to them. May Allah fill their graves with light, as a consequence of hard work of these lovers of prophet we have with us tremendous knowledge about the history of the prophet

<sup>1</sup> All these titles Mr. "Truth Teller" has used for the *Imams* of *hadith*.

and his companions with all details, and also those sources on the basis of which we can evaluate the treasure of *hadith* and correctly investigate the events occurred in that period. Refuters of *hadith* say that except continuous narrations<sup>1</sup> متواتر روایات (which are very little) other *hadiths* are not reliable, they give not certain knowledge, at the most we receive more probable guess, then what means to base religion on such things? We say that except eye witness and sensual experiment there is no source in the world beneficial to knowledge. Continuous narrations are also considered certain on the basis of the belief that it is beyond reason to join large number of people together on lie. But out of the conditions for continuous messages very little are found in those which seem to be continuous. Our knowledge and decisions about unseen matters of past or present are often based on the same most probable guess that is obtained through at least two witnesses. The Quran itself has made this witness-based guess so reliable that killing of a Muslim on its basis becomes allowed, even though according to the same Quran, the blood of a Muslim is so respectable that the killer of a Muslim with intention will be punished in hell for ever. Similarly, in the cases of adultery (زنا), blaming chaste women (قذف) and theft the basis of important decisions about punishment is only two or four witnesses whereby the hand of a Muslim may be amputated, his back may be lashed. Thus, if the entire system of justice is founded by the Quran on discontinuous (غير متواتر) witnesses, then in contrast to the Quran, which Muslim can dare say that for accepting any *hadith* as the *hadith* of *Rasul* the presence of two or four narrators at each stage of authentication is not enough? However, we shall not rely on every narrator

---

<sup>1</sup> Continuous narrations متواتر روایات are those narrations which are narrated by more than two persons in each generation.

just as we do not rely on each witness. According to the command of the Quran we apply the condition of just men (ذوا عدل) for which a unique art of knowing about people (here narrators) i.e. *Asma al-Rijal* (اسما الرجال) was invented, so that the character and activities of narrators may be investigated. Similarly we shall discuss about narrators; if there is such difference in substantial points of the *hadith* which makes the correctness of their narrations doubtful? Similarly we shall make use of the principle of *Darayat* (درایت)<sup>1</sup> also, as a judge makes use of it in legal cases. But as the examination of witness reports is not the work of every man, *Darayat* is also not the game of children. Only that person can examine *hadith* on the principle of *Darayat* who has well understood the basic principles of Islam after thorough knowledge of the Quran and who has developed insight in the examination of *hadith* after deep study of most of the part of *hadith* literature. Extensive and intensive study develops in man a capability of understanding the temperament of *Rasul* and correct spirit of Islam settles in his heart and mind. Then as soon as he looks at a *hadith* he understands whether the prophet (SAW) could have said it or not? Or his action could have been as described in *hadith*? Moreover, as the inference (اجتهاد) of two judges differs, and the interpretation of the Quran by two learned person may be different, the difference in *Darayat* of two *muhaddiths* (*hadith* scholars) is also possible. Allah has not made us responsible more than human capability. Difference of opinion is in the nature of man; neither the

---

<sup>1</sup> The status of *darayat* in the art of *hadith* is the same as is the status of judge's opinion and decision in law. Like a judge who does not lightly accept every witness but makes opinion after thinking on them from various angles, a *Muhaddith* (*hadith* compiler) also does not accept every *hadith* with closed eyes. He looks it from different angles and then makes his opinion. This process is known as *Darayat*

Quran can be given up because of this, nor *hadith*, nor the chair of court. Thus, whatever research is within the power of man, the scholars have left for us the material about a *hadith*. Our work is to make use of this material and distinguish the accurate from erroneous, not to break relations from *Risalat* itself after seeing the mixture of right and wrong.

Refuters of *hadith* say that we shall take *hadith* only as history and not make it an argument for *shari'ah*. But do they consider the history of *Rasul* like the history of Alexander and Napoleon, that it makes no difference if it is accurate or erroneous? Do they not understand even that it is the history of a person whose obedience is necessary on which salvation is based; whose character is a model for Muslims? History of that holy person will either be right or wrong. If wrong, its taking has no meaning, put it to fire. The prophet is blamed and you accept it as history? And, if it is right, its obedience is obligatory. How can you find leave from obeying it?

In the light of the presentations of *hadith* refuters, there can be two causes of rejecting *hadith*:

1. That there is as such no need of *hadith* in the religious system of Islam; the Quran is enough.
2. That the *hadiths* are not reliable

First of these causes has already been discussed and well attended to. As for the second; its mistake also has been discussed in hints. However, it is necessary that this doubt should also be removed in depth and details. The cause of considering the *hadith* unreliable is that our doubt crosses limits. The spirit of doubt has been given to man so that it may move him for discussion, investigation, search and research, and prompt him to find truth. But for everything there is a limit, out of which it remains no more admirable. If the spirit of doubt becomes so high



that it does not let man satisfy with those methods of research which are commonly available to man, and prompts him to refute anything not acceptable to the impossible level of standard, then it is a contemptible attribute which we call in our Urdu language as *wahmi pun* (وہمی پن) and which can be rendered into English as over-suspicion.

If we think we come to know that man is bound to depend in most of the matters on research which gives us high probability. If he doubts in this research and rejects everything before certain knowledge, he will no more remain useful to the world, and perhaps he may not keep living too. For example I have not seen till date any person dying due to snake bite, nor have I been bitten by a snake so that I could have certain knowledge of its being lethal. I have only heard people saying that man dies because of snake bite. I believe in this narration and keep away from snake wherever I look at it. But if I doubt on this narration and say, "so long as snake does not bite anybody before me and he dies not because of it in front of me, I will not believe that snake is lethal", the consequence of my doubt is obvious.

This is but the example of continuous narration (روایت متواترہ) which is generally accepted to be useful to beliefs. But in our life there are uncountable cases where we accept news only on the basis of one or two narrators (this news is known as *khobar-e-wahid* خبر واحد in terms of *hadith* literature) and keep foundation of our decisions, knowledge and actions on them. News as such has equal possibility of both lie and truth, but for giving weight to one of them we do not concentrate only on the news as such but generally take help of exterior situations and tilt toward its being true or false, and sometimes this tilt is so strong that we are not ready to accept even the possibility

of the other. For example everybody receives by his mother the information of his being the legal child of his father. In this *khavar-e-wahid* for which the other witness can never be found there is equal possibility of truth and lie. But a noble man will never be ready to accept lie in it to any level; what to say about possibility, even if his belief in the narration of his mother is wrong.

You can claim that this situation is related to sentiments. I say in those cases also where sentiments are not involved we are habitual of giving weight to either the truth or falsity of *Khavar-e-wahid* after possible examination, and even if this weighing gives only higher probability, we act on it as we do in case of certain knowledge. Most important and delicate matter in our life is that of court where sentiments are not involved even equal to a grain, but decisions are based on pure, real and rational examination. Whatever number of cases are presented to Judge belong to the past events; very little number and very rare cases of them have continuous witnesses. In most of the case *akhbar-e-ahaad* (plural of *khavar-e-wahid*) are presented to the Judge who tilts towards any of the possible aspects of truth or falsity on the bases of cross questions, situations, hints, evidences and rational analogy. Once he is satisfied with his tilt he gives decision in a way as if the event has been proven to him to the extent of certainty. If a Judge begins his work with the view that every witness is a liar and each narration is wrong, and for accepting every event he emphasizes that either it should have occurred before him or continuous narrations should reach him, it is certain that he will have to leave the chair of the court within few seconds.

Similarly in trade, governance and other matters of the world our dealings go on based upon the *akhbar-e-*

*ahaad*, and we get much information through telegram and news papers in whose truth there are rationally many chances of doubt. We cannot say with certainty that the same person whose name is written on the telegram has sent it to us. If the telegram is from the same person, then also we do not know what is his source of information? And his source is reliable or not? Many such possibilities are there in information every telegram. But those whose entire business runs on this basis hardly think of these possibilities. They test by apparent situations that the telegram is from their agent or not? And after getting most probable opinion they invest *lakhs* of rupees.

Same is the situation in religious matters. Greatest and the most important thing on which our faith is based is the Noble Quran. We came to know about its being the words of God only on the witness of a single person and that witness is the respected *Rasul*. As for its being a message as such there is possibility of both truth and falsity. But keeping in view of the truth, trust and holy character of the witnessing person and rationality of the truth we give preference to the side of truth over the side of falsity of the message. And later the same preference settles in our heart in the form of deep faith so that no question of falsity ever arises. But on the other side there are many people who doubt in the witness of this trustworthy observer and are denying him only because of doubt. The only difference between us and them is that we accepted the witness of that true observer and became Muslim. They doubted in his witness and became unbeliever. Otherwise, it is obvious that neither we nor they looked descending the revelation.

It has become clear from this discussion that in general, the average people are in their life not as weak believers as to accept every message without investigation

and research, nor are they as doubtful and suspicious as to doubt in each message and its narrator, and demand for that kind of certain knowledge which is obtained only by experiment, observation or continuous narration. In between these two extremes there are people having sound intellect and balanced nature whose line of action is to examine information and narrations with available methods of research. They neglect the information if the probability of their being wrong is more (not certainty), and accept it if the probability (not certainty) of truth is more, and then act accordingly. The standard of examination is not also same for all types of messages but it is hard or soft depending upon the importance and nature of message and related matter.

It was the aspect of the problem from the point of view of knowledge. Now if you will think on it from the point of view of reason, you will come to know that the same balanced method that we have chosen is just according to reason and intellect. And in contrast to it both, weak belief and suspiciousness are against reason. It is correct that, for reason it is possible to doubt every event, even in senses and observations, but it is not necessary that every act which is possible should also be considered good by reason. Moreover, reason gives only one judgment about every new. That is there is equal probability of truth or falsity in it i.e. as being a news as such there is an equal chance of truth or falsity so long there is no other reasonable cause to support any one of them, the news may neither be called true or false. But no news reaches us as pure news; certain situations are necessarily associated with it which tilts the pan either towards truth or falsehood. The position of pure doubt having neither confirmation nor rejection is a highly delicate position so that man's mind cannot stay there

even for moments. Therefore, as soon as a person listens to any news, his mind begins to search for causes with the help of which it may take turn from doubt to either reject or confirm. Then it depends upon the mind's being ill or healthy whether it prefers any of the two on unreasonable or reasonable bases. Any narration not being continuous (متواتر) or having only one source (خبر واحد) has no enough reason that it might be claimed wrong only on this basis. Nor it is enough and reasonable cause for declaring any news to be wrong that it belongs to an old and ancient period, and reached us through many media. Also, no reasonable person can suppose that every narrator is a liar and all reporters have jointly decided to give false news. All these kinds of suppositions which often overwhelm people having falsifying mentality and because of which they tilt to reject all news, are totally against reason. Similarly the contrary situation i.e. all those suppositions based on which every message and every narrator is confirmed are also not reasonable. Between these two extremes the right way which a sound natured mind will opt is not to confirm or reject as a whole any news, but will examine each of the news separately on the standard according to the situations of each event. When after this examination he will confirm or reject on the basis of more probability of any one.

Now, we should see what might be the hardest and practicable standard of examining any message? Suppose a person named Zaid has passed 100 years before about whom a person named as Omru conveys a report to you. You have to investigate whether this report is correct or wrong? You can take following steps to achieve this goal.

1. How this report reached Omru? Links in between the chain of narrators reach up to Omru or not? Narrators present in the chain one after the other happened

to meet each other or not? In which age and condition each of the narrators received the report? Did he narrate the report literally word by word or transmitted in his own words?

2. Has the same report been narrated through other channels also? If it so whether all narrations coincide or differ? If there is difference how far it is? If there is an open difference, the narration of which channel is more reliable?

3. How the narrators themselves are? Are they liars or trustless? Was there any hidden objective of them or the group they belonged to? Did they have the ability to remember and transmit correctly or not?

4. Is this narration against or not, those continuous narrations or proven knowledge that we already have about the nature, character, opinions and the environment of Zaid?

5. Whether the report is about extraordinary and unimaginable matter or ordinary and imaginable matter? If it is the first case whether the channels of report are as many, continuous and reliable as to become acceptable? If it is the second case whether the narration in its present form is enough to satisfy about the matter reported?

These are the five points according to which any report can be examined. If the methods of investigation related to these questions are available to us and if any report falls true to the standard of investigation by using these methods, then there remains nothing with us to falsify or reject the report. But if any person despite having the methods of investigation, instead of examining each and every report and then making opinion about it rejects or falsifies the whole lot of reports because some fake reports are mixed, or the weaknesses of some of the reporters are proven, or some of the reports do not fit in

the mind set of the investigator himself, then there can be no other behaviour more irrational than this.

This description has made the matter quite clear. However, it would be a different matter if anybody does not want to keep associated with the best model of the prophet and his holy *sunnah*. But if he considers necessary the imitation of the prophet (SAW) and really needs to know, how the prophet (SAW) passed his 23 year's life as prophet, which acts he did, from which acts did he refrained from, which of the things he allowed and which he prohibited, he will have to concentrate necessarily on the *hadith* literature. Here also he will come to know that even today there are four or five *lakhs* of persons in the world to whom the books of *hadith* have reached through Imam Malik, Imam Muhammad, Imam Shafi'i, Imam Ahmad bin Hanbal, Imam Bukhari and other Imams of *hadith* with continuous chain. Therefore, there is no doubt that these books have been written by them. Also, no doubt can be raised to the fact that the authenticity of the report that these people have linked to the prophet (SAW) was satisfactory according to their investigation. Thus, through these books the knowledge of *hadith* which was available to the Imams of *hadith* in first, second, third and fourth century *hijri* has reached to us nearly certainly. Moreover, all that information related to *hadith* has reached to us through reliable books which these Imams of *hadith* used to examine the *hadiths* and the life of their reporters. The investigative questions we have framed above regarding news, we find in these books their detailed answer nearly about each *hadith*. Moreover, those differences which occurred between Imams of *hadith* regarding their investigation are also protected with all arguments and causes. An intelligent person having the wide spectrum of detailed and most

probably reliable material before him can never claim that any event or saying of the prophet (SAW) is not available in correct form in the world. One, who claims this, will have to prove that more than *lakhs* and *crores* of people engaged in listening and transmitting the sayings of the *Rasul* were all lairs and had collectively decided that they will pass whole of their life in blaming *Rasulullah* and thus misguiding Muslims and distorting Islam. If any refuter of *hadith* has proof to this effect, he should present it. We assure him that the achievements of all the investigators and discoverers of the world will be dumped before his unique research. But if he has nothing other than bad opinions, false blames and confusing, unreasonable and untruthful methods of applying parts on the whole to present in proof, he should not at least expect that the reasonable and naturally sound persons will accept his claim and falsify the entire treasure of *hadith* and reject it as a whole.

We have never supported the view that the Imams of *hadith* should be imitated blindly and considered flawless. Nor have we ever claimed that anything presented with "*Rasulullah* says" should be accepted as *hadith* with blind eyes. In contrast to it in our view the responsibility of calling a *hadith* as the *hadith* of *Rasul* is a grave responsibility; one should never dare to shoulder it without enough investigation. And about research and mental labour also our view is that its doors are always open in every period; it is not meant especially for a particular time. But it also never means that those who have not consumed even a month in disciplined study and research should criticize those who have served this art for entire life. Not only in the field of *hadith*, but in none of the fields of knowledge and art, are the beginners and unskilled persons ever allowed to give opinion as skilled



persons. This right is given to a person only after he has comprehended the basics of the art, and he keeps an eye on the entire treasure of the discipline. As for the one who has not reached this stage, it is safe for him to follow the research and opinions of the Imams of the field. Like all worldly sciences the same method is better and correct for religious knowledge also. Those who hoist the flag of research without knowledge only invite defame to themselves in the world and hereafter.

**Tarjumanul Quran: Safar, 1353 A.H; June, 1934 A.C.**

## Balanced Way

Not a single Muslim can deny the fact that the obedience of sayings and actions of the prophet (SAW) is obligatory in matters of religion, and the only source of religious knowledge after the Holy Quran is the way of the prophet (SAW). After this the only question that remains to be solved is what are the different forms of knowledge about the way of the prophet (SAW) and what is the status and importance of each form in religion?

Things which have reached us about the prophet (SAW) can be divided into two types. One is that which has reached continuously to us, be it about his actions or sayings. The other is that which has not reached us with continuity. There is a consensus of entire *Ummah* and the judgment of reason also is that the first type must be considered as sure and certain truth, because certainty of continuous narration is universally accepted. As for the second type, all scholars consider it estimation in principle. Nobody claims that it is necessarily useful in knowledge. Whatever difference of opinion has occurred is in the matter how those narrations should be taken which have been narrated by a single man? There are three different schools of thought regarding this problem.

A group says that the entire treasure of *hadith* is estimation; therefore, it is to be rejected as a whole, because estimation is not proven and unproven things are not to be followed. But the mistake of this group becomes explicit after little thought. No doubt that estimation is not proven, but it never means that it should be rejected. If certainty is a necessary condition for obedience, then please tell how many "certainties" are there in the world? In how many cases of your life you act according to

certainties only, and reject opinions as a whole? You will come to know only after little analysis and solutions that this method has neither worked in life nor can it ever work. What category of mistake is accepting opinions as a whole, the same category of mistake is to reject them as such. It is the compulsion of reason, and also the man follows the rule in all matters of life that all opinions should not be measured and directed by the same stick but difference should be maintained between them. Everything from among them should be examined separately and by using different modes of research we should try to know what is closer in degree to certainty or away from it. Reject what is away, accept what is closer and keep patience in case it is in between the two. This is the principle according to which all matters are dealt with throughout the world. And as our religion is not unreasonable, the same principle should be followed in religious matters too. At least we could not find a single ayah in the Quran declaring this principle against truth. The *ayat* regarding the evil of those who follow opinions do not aim at telling that opinion making is a sin, and it is compulsory to refrain from it as such; it only means to tell that the opinion and guess against revelation (وحى) or that which is used without caring for revelation is the cause of misguidance.

Rejection of *hadiths* as a whole has following demerits. First of all a believer becomes deprived of prophetic guidance in individual matters. Influence analogy and opinions becomes so large in detailed matters of practice that it endangers even the spirit of principal commands. Moreover, if there is no authenticity in details, the individuality will obviously find its way. Everybody will follow any way he will like according to his opinion and inclination and there will be no such authority which

may stop differences to reach the last limits of individuality. Consider for example the Friday prayer. Among the certain sources of knowledge we have, the first and the greatest source i.e. the Quran tells us only that you run fast for prayer as soon as the call of Friday prayer is given.

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا إِذَا نُودِيَ لِلصَّلَاةِ مِنْ يَوْمِ الْجُمُعَةِ  
فَاسْعَوْا إِلَى ذِكْرِ اللَّهِ

*O ye who believe! When the call is proclaimed to prayer on Friday, hasten earnestly to the remembrance of Allah*  
(Al-juma: 9)

A large majority of Muslims follows this command. In contrast, if one man's reports are altogether rejected provision for uncountable ways become possible none of which have supporting authority which may tie up not more even two Muslims to a single way in a particular method. Its consequence is obvious; the power of togetherness of Friday will finish, differences in practice will kill the aim for which the Friday prayer has been made obligatory.

We have presented Friday only as an example. You will come to know after little reflection that the thing which makes the *shari'ah* system of Islam a permanent practical system and which molds the Muslim culture, civilization, social interactions, economy, politics, their entire collective life and individual behaviour in a permanent and detailed form is but the knowledge that we gain through single man's narrations. Public and private life of *Rasulullah* (SAW), his moral, habits, method of worship, way of teaching and preaching, judiciary, judgments; his guidelines and mode of action in different aspects of life; moreover, the ways of his vicegerents, companions, family members are such things which present the entire picture of Islamic activity, and Islam

becomes a complete system of life based on this picture. But the source of these things is neither the Quran nor continuity of narrations. It is only the single man's reports that provide us with grand treasure of knowledge and guidance. Efface all this, then Islam will remain no more than a skeleton without flesh and skin, one will make its body and face as he would like. In fact in this situation no system of collectivity could be established, what to say of the existence of any Islamic culture and civilization. The fact is that only those people are raising objections against *hadith* who want to disorganize the system of Islamic culture. They do not find any relief to achieve the goals of their lust and wishes within the frame of its limitations that is why they have followed the way of distorting the bases which limit the boundaries of this system. Thereafter, we shall be free to provide flesh and skin to the skeleton of Islam as we wish and make its face as we like.

These people present those *hadiths* as examples to reject whole of the *hadith* literature which are contradictory, or those in which there are reverse comments on prophets, or those which are against reason or the Quran. These people argue to reject whole *hadith* literature based on these individual examples. But this argumentation is just as to argue for the evil of the whole nation on the bases of the ill manners of some of the people. When each report is different in text and authority from the other report opinion should be made about each after separate investigation, whether it is acceptable or should be rejected altogether. Considering all of them together and making same opinion about the whole cannot be the work of a reasonable man. When these people will look at *hadiths* separately, they will come to know that if there are few *hadiths* about which the heart says that these

cannot be the sayings of *Rasul* (SAW), there is a large number full of the pearls of wisdom, in which best principles of law and moral are found, which enlighten us best with the reality, utility and wisdom of Islam and heart says that these can be the words of a *Rasul* (SAW) only. Moreover, if these people are truth and justice seekers, they would see that the researchers of *hadith* have done such labour in collecting, sorting and protecting the news and events of the period of prophet and his companions that no other group of the world has done for the history of other periods. Methods that they utilized in critical evaluation of *hadith*, no reason of man till date could evolve methods better than these to know about past events. This group used all the best reliable methods and sources possible in human capacity and applied them so strictly that the history does not present any example elsewhere. This is the only truth that provides certainty to the belief that Allah's help had been working from behind, and the One Who had arranged for the protection of His Book had also made exemplary arrangements to protect the foot prints and signs of guidance of his last prophet.

This was all about that group which wants to declare entire *hadith* literature as rejected on the basis of probability of *hadiths* in principle. Now consider the other group who has tilted towards another extreme. These people are far more beyond and strict in favour of following the *hadith* scholars. They claim that the *hadith* scholars have separated milk from water; they have told about each and every *hadith* which of them is reliable and to what extent, and which one is unreliable. Our work is only to keep them according to their categories and give status of reliability and arbitration. For example we should leave weak as compared to the strong in authority; accept

correct which they have declared correct and reject at all which they have criticized. Consider allowed which they have declared as allowed and refrain from what they have prohibited. Faithfully follow the opinions they have given about the justice, memory and authenticity of narrators. We should follow exactly the same standard which our seniors have fixed for the reliability or unreliability of the *hadith*. For example we should compulsorily prefer famous *hadith* over the rare, disconnected between the prophet and the companions over that whose chain connects up to the prophet, and continuous over the discontinuous, and we should not deflect from the line they have drawn even as little as a hair's thickness. It is this point of view, whose strictness has pushed people having little knowledge to another extreme of rejecting the *hadith* literature as a whole.

Services of *hadith* scholars (RA) are acceptable; also acceptable is that the material they have collected in search of information and proofs about the first period is very valuable; there is no debate on this point, the debate is on how far it is correct to rely on it? After all they were human being. They cannot go beyond the limits of knowledge which Allah has naturally fixed for them. At least their works were not protected from those shortcomings which naturally remain in human endeavors. Then how can you claim that which they considered correct was also actually correct? They were themselves not perfectly certain. At the most they said that this *hadith* is most certain. Moreover, this high probability was based on narration, not on reason. They were weaker from this angle than the exerting scholars of *fiqh* (فقهاء مجتهدین). Thus together with the acceptance of their achievements within allowed limits, this has to be agreed that their research about *hadith* has two kinds of weaknesses: one from the

point of view of the authenticity of source and the other from the viewpoint of *fiqh*.

To explain what has been said above, we shall discuss some of the defects found in the two aspects. To begin with the examination of any report the first thing which is investigated is the quality of those people through which it has come. In this connection every reporter is tested from different angles. Is he a liar, careless in reporting, transgressor and bad believer, superstitious, forgetful? Whether he is unknown or generally known? *Hadith* scholars have collected the names of people after this kind of examination which proves to be a great and invaluable treasure of information. But in which aspect of this great endeavor there is no possibility of mistake? First of all it is very difficult to know about the internal aspects of other people like their character and memory and others. Moreover, those opinion making scholars also were not protected from mistake. Self (*nafs*) was associated with everyone and it was very possible that their good or bad opinion about any person be subjective. This possibility is not simply rational but there is proof to the fact that this has actually occurred severally. The respected person like Hammad opines about the people of Hijaz that "they had no knowledge; even your children have knowledge more than those". He has this opinion about great scholars like 'Ata, Ta'us and Mujahid. And who is this Hammad? He is the teacher of Imam Abu Hanifah and the representative disciple of Ibrahim al-Nakha'i. Look at Imam Zuhri! He comments upon the *Makki* people of his time, "I have not seen weaker in Islamic knowledge more than the people of *Makka*" even though in his period *Makka* was not devoid of respectable scholars and pious people. Sha'bi and Nakha'i, both are the people of great honour, but how



they attack each other. Sha'bi says that Ibrahim al-Nakha'i asks us for the solutions of problems in night. And in the day he explains them to people from his self. Ibrahim al-Nakha'i says, "He reports from the liar Masrooq even though he has not met him". Look at Dahhak, once stick to his words he said about the companions, "We know more than them". Respectable and carefully strict Sa'eed bin Jubair blames Sha'bi for lying about a problem and says to his servant, "Do not lie about me as Ikramah lied about Ibn-e-'Abbas. Look at the splendid position of Imam Malik and his remark about a personality like Ibn-e- Ishaq, "He is one of many *Dajjals*". More wondrous than this, are his reverse remarks on the scholars of Iraq, "We treat them like we treat with the people of books; neither support them nor deny". What a splendid *faqih* فقيه Imam Abu Hanifah is? He says about A'mash, "He never fasted in Ramadan nor did he took compulsory bath" The only cause was that A'mash believed in the words 'from water' (من الماء) instead of 'the water' (*al-Maa'*), and used to eat in the morning of Ramadan (سحر) according to the *hadith* of Huzaifa. What a high standard scholar Abdullah ibn Mubarak is? Once he was also overtaken by stubbornness and spoke about Imam Malik, "I do not consider him a scholar. Yahya bin Mo'in has commented upon very strong scholars of his time like Zuhri, Aowza'i, Abu Osman al-Nadhi and Taa'us, so far so that once he said about Imam Shafi'i that he is not strong. Most strange of all these examples is the fact that sometimes the companions (RA) of the prophet (SAW) also proved to be human beings and passed reverse remarks on one another. Ibn Omar was told that Abu Hurairah does not consider *Witr* to be compulsory. He reacted that Abu Hurairah is a liar. Once upon a time Hadrat Ayesha commented upon

Anas and Abu Sa'eed Khudri, "What do they know about the sayings of the prophet (SAW)? They were children at that time". Once *Hadrat* Hasan was asked about the meaning of *Shahidan wamash, hud*. He explained it. Some people said, "Ibn Omar and Ibn Zubair say so and so". He reacted, "Both are liars". Once, *Hadrat* Ali declared Mughirah bin Sha'bah as liar. When telling about the solution of a problem, Ubadah bin Samit blamed Masood bin Ows Ansari to speak lie even though he was the participant of *Badr*<sup>1</sup>.

We do not mean to say by presenting these examples that the entire literature of the knowledge about narrators is wrong. We only mean to say that the scholars who have developed arguments about the narrators were also human being after all. Human weaknesses were also associated with them. Is it necessary that the narrators considered strong by them should be truly strong and in all matters, and those whom they have declared as weak should really be weak and, should all their narrations be uncertain? It is even more difficult to know about the memory, good intention and correct preservation of each of the narrators; most difficult is to investigate whether a scholar has kept in view all related aspects of narration which may be important in making inferences from the point of view of *fiqh*.

This is the situation concerning the knowledge about narrators. Second important thing after it is the chain of authentic reports. Every *muhaddith* (*hadith* scholar) has tried to investigate whether the narrator is the contemporary and has met or not the person whom he refers to? If he happened to meet him whether he heard the *hadith* directly from the very person whom he has

---

<sup>1</sup> All these examples have been collected from the "*Kitab Jame' Bayaanul Ilm*" of 'Allamah Ibn-e-Abdul Barr.

referred to or he heard it from any other person and transferred without quoting him? They tried to investigate all these things to the extent of human capacity, but it is not necessary that they would have found correctly all that they wanted. It is very possible that the report which is continuous in their judgment is truly discontinuous and they could not know about a weak person in between. Similarly it is very possible that some of the reports given by them different categories of weak reports, like *mursal* (مرسل), *mo'dal* (معضل) or *munqata'* (منقطع) might be have come from strong narrators and be completely correct.

These and many others are such matters based on which the knowledge of authenticity, argumentation and justification cannot be considered perfectly correct. All this material is dependable in taking help from in search of the *sunnah* of the prophet and the activities of his companions and not considered dispensable but it may not be totally and blindly relied upon.

As we have told above the *muhaddithin* (*hadith* scholars) -----Allah is merciful to them----- concentrated on investigating reports from the angle of the quality of narrator and their continuity. Therefore, they were possessed by the viewpoint of news transmitters; they stressed upon the quality of news based on authenticity and continuity of reporters. As far as the point of view of *fiqh* (i.e. to make opinion whether the *hadith* is acceptable in its text or not), it was to some extent out of question for their subject, that is why it often remained overlooked and they gave only little consideration to this aspect. That is why often they have declared a narration correct though it is not much appealing as to the content and meaning. There are other reports which they have declined to accept though they seem correct in meaning. There is no space at

hand to explain this point with detailed examples. But the fact is not unknown to those who have insight in the matters of *shari'ah* that the viewpoint of *muhaddithin* in many matters differs from the point of view of *fuqaha* (plural of *faqih*) and *muhaddithin* have not kept balance in making inference from even correct *hadith* equal to the finished *fuqaha* (فقهاء مجتهدين).

It has become clear from the above discussion that as the refuters of *hadith* are wrong, the blind dependents of narrations are also not protected from mistake. The true way is there in between, and the finished *fuqaha* have adopted the same. We see many problems in the *fiqh* of Imam Abu Hanifah which are base on weak *hadiths* like *mursal*, *mu'dal* and *munqat'a*, or in weak *hadith* has preferred over strong one, or in which *hadith* says something other than what Imam Abu Hanifa and his disciples say. The same is the situation in the *fiqh* of Imam Malik. Even though in his *fiqh* also the narrative point of view is prevalent yet in many cases his understanding compelled him going against *hadiths* authenticated by *muhaddithin*. Thus Lais bin Sa'd has pointed out about 70 problems of this type from his *fiqh*. Imam Shafa'i also is not much different. May Allah save us! It never means that they used to overlook *hadith* even after knowing it to be correct. The fact was that they did not depend solely on the authenticity of report but also used other standard to test the *hadith* and accepted it when satisfied that it is nearer to truth, even if it is to be neglected from the point of view of a *muhaddith*.

What is this another standard? We have hinted to this standard few times before also. One whom Allah blesses with understanding develops in him through deep study of the Quran and the character of the prophet (SAW) a special taste which is just like the insight of an old jeweler

which can test the subtlest properties of jewels. He keeps in his vision the complete system of the rightful *shari'ah* as a whole and recognizes the nature of this system. After that whenever particulars are presented to him his taste tells him which of the particulars is according to the temperament and nature of Islam and which is not. The same standard becomes the measure of rejection and acceptance whenever he looks at a narration. The temperament of Islam is just the temperament of prophet's self. One who understands the temperament of Islam and deeply studied the Book of God and the *sunnah* of His prophet he so closely understand the spirit of the holy prophet that his insight itself tells to him after looking at the narration, which of the activity may be the activity of my chief (SAW) and which thing is nearer to the prophet's *sunnah*. Not only this, but also that in the matters in which they do not find anything in the Quran and *sunnah* he could confidently say, "if this problem was presented to the prophet (SAW) he would have decided this way". This is because his soul is lost in the soul of Muhammad (SAW) and sight unites with the insight of the prophet. His brain molds into the caste of Islam, he looks and thinks the way the Islam wants to be seen and thought. When a man reaches this level of union he remains no more needful to the reports. Of course, he seeks help from the reports but his decision does not totally depend upon them. Sometimes he makes best use of unique, weak, discontinuous and even rebuked *hadith* because he is able to see the glow of diamond inside rejected stone. And sometimes he overlooks an unquestioned, normally known, continuous and accepted *hadith* because the meaning filled in that golden report do not seem to him according to the nature of Islam and prophetic temperament.

As this thing is related entirely to the taste, it does not and cannot come under any regulative system; that is why there was space for differences in the past as it is today and also in future. Therefore, there have been many differences in particulars between expert Imams. Moreover, it is not such a thing in which the taste of a person should necessarily and completely be according to the other person. And because of this even the Imams of same school have differed in many problems. The differences between Imam Abu Hanifa and his disciples are clear examples of this. It is also not necessary that the taste an expert should reach at the truth in every problem. Man is after all full of weaknesses. Greatest expert may commit to and actually commits mistakes. Because of this, the expert Imams have always been fearful, and instructing to their followers not to completely depend upon them; keep on doing self research and whenever a *sunnah* against our viewpoint is proven, then follow the *sunnah* and reject our view. Imam Abu Yusuf says:

“It is not permissible to anybody to give verdict on the basis of our saying so long as he does not know about our source”.

Imam Zufar says:

“We decide with our opinion in absence of *hadith*. When the *hadith* is found we leave our opinion and follow the *hadith*”.

Imam Malik’s words are as follows:

“I am a human being, commit mistakes as well as decide correctly. Therefore, you look at my opinion with care, take what is according to the Book and *sunnah* and leave what is against it”.

Imam Shafi’i suggests:

“When you find correct *hadith* you strike my words to the wall. And nobody has a right to say anything against the *sunnah* of *Rasul*”.

Thus all Imams concomitantly say that it is *haram* to prefer other's view for a person to whom the *sunnah* of *Rasul* has been enlightened upon.

**Tarjumanul Quran: Safar, 1356 A.H.; May, 1937 C.E.**

## Some Additional Discussions

Objections raised by some people of *Ahl-e-Hadith* after the publication of this paper and my answers to them seem advisable to discuss here.

### Question of an *ahl-e-hadith* friend:

(a) On which fundamental source (*Nass*) is based the consideration of all the four *fiqh* right by Muslims?

(b) Which of the two i.e. understanding of and expert and authentic report have more probability and guess?

(c) Can there be a single person simultaneously *Muhaddith* and *Faqih* or not, and has he a higher status on the two equipped with one separately?

(d) Give any example in which Imam Abu Hanifa, keeping in view of the text, accepted the weak *hadith* in presence of the strong one.

(e) Is the saying of the Imams that as compared to their decision the strong *hadith* is to be followed, is correct?

(f) What is the standard of *Draayat* (reasoning) based on which the strong *hadith* may be overlooked? Moreover, please tell which of the basic sources (*Nass*) has provided this condition of *Darayat* and its standard?

(g) Does any Muslim have a right to drive back through the interference of *Darayat* from the command of Allah and *Rasul* when it has reached to him with high probability and differ from it based on his understanding (*tafaqquh*) though there is probability in understanding also?



### Answers:

(a) Consideration of four *fiqh* as right is not based on *nass* but it is because all the four schools of *fiqh* follow those rules for deriving inference from the book and the *sunnah* which have accommodation and basis in *shari'ah*. Even if there are deep differences among them in particulars and even if there are reasonable causes of these differences, yet in these schools same methods of inference have been used which are proven in the light of the book and *sunnah* and which the companions (RA) of the prophet (SAW) have use in deriving inferences.

(b) Both the authority of report and understanding of the expert cannot be given a degree above the other. Authority of a *hadith* is a witness as to what extent the narration of a *hadith* is reliable? And the understanding of an expert is the research of a person who makes an assessment after deep insight in the book and *sunnah* about a report as to what extent it is acceptable or not, or to what extent the meaning of the narration fit or do not fit in the whole frame of *shari'ah*? Both of these are separate entities. As in courts the witnesses and the decision of judge, both have their own and separate status; neither it can be claimed that the decision of judge has a degree above witnesses nor the vice versa. Similarly the witness of *muhaddith* and the expert research of *faqih* cannot be placed on status one above the other.

(c) There is possibility of mistake in both the understanding of expert and the authority of *hadith*. Therefore, in my view it is necessary that a knowledgeable person must investigate the *shar'i* command after looking into the opinion of experts and the narrations of the *hadiths*. As for those who cannot investigate by themselves it is correct for them to rely on a scholar or act according a *hadith* if available.

(d) A man can be a *muhammadith* and *faqih* simultaneously, and such a person is preferable in principle as compared to any one of them. But my response is only in principle. As for applying it on a particular person it will have to be necessarily seen whether his status in understanding (*tafaqquh*) is the same as it is in memorizing the *hadith*.

(e) For the time being, I have not example as demanded. Moreover, examples only lengthen the discussion.

(f) Whatever the expert Imams have said is correct and I also have the same view. But whatever I have said it means that sometimes correctly authenticated *hadiths* have weak aspects in the text which does not correspond to the information received through other sources. In these situations it becomes unavoidable to either interpret the *hadith* or reject it.

(g) *Darayat* means understanding of religion (*deen*) which has been expressed in the Quran as "*hikamah*" (wisdom) and this *hikmah* has the same status for correct following of *deen* as it is that of perfect intelligence in the practice of medicine. Those who have little of it or do not care for its value, it is suitable for them only to follow what they find in written form. But if those who have been rewarded by the mercy of God with this insight in the Quran and *sunnah* do not make use of it will commit to sin in my view.

(h) In my view there is no such source to tell you about any scale by using of which you may look by measurements that anybody is equipped with it or not and how much anybody has received it. It is just like that there cannot be a measurement of the intelligence of a medicine man, testing power of jewels in a jeweler and the technical expertise of an expert any field; these things cannot be

just measured. But the inability to legitimize does not mean that it does not exist or it has no place in *shari'ah*.

(i) The answer to this question can be found above answers. More to tell it can be said that surely, there is possibility of mistake in the use of *Darayat*. But the same possibility is there in declaring any *hadith* as correct, weak or fabricated. If a Muslim commits crime by mistaking during the use of *Darayat*, equal crime is committed by the other Muslim by mistaking in dividing *hadiths* into different categories under discussion. But Islamic *shari'ah* makes a person responsible to the extent of his abilities and considers him answerable only to that degree.

### **The Letter of another *Ahl-e-Hadith* Friend:**

“Differences in practice within the boundaries of the Book and *sunnah* is a different matter and also tolerable. But giving equal status in principle to the *hadith* of *Rasul* and *Darayat* of an expert (*mujtahid*) cannot be tolerated. Moreover in certain conditions this is like rejection of *hadith*. Even the big Hanafite scholars do not accept it. Imam Abu Hanifah himself has acquitted from and shown displeasure to this opinion. Details can be seen in *Hujjatullah-il-Balighah* and *Shaami*”.

### **Answer:**

This phrase of yours, i.e. “giving equal status in principle to the *hadith* of *Rasul* and *Darayat* of an expert”, is certainly not correct presentation of my opinion. Moreover, your view that “in certain conditions this is like rejection of *hadith*” touches the boundaries of injustice. You yourself think, with justice, on the essays I have written about *hadith* in this book, and the way I have been reasoning on the basis of and fighting in favour of *hadith*

in other essays and books; was it possible to doubt on me that I have or could have the least inclination towards the rejecters of *hadith*? Moreover, if you consider me a believer and a Muslim, how could you guess that I would have preferred the understanding (*tafaqquh*), expertise or the words of any Imam over a narration even after accepting it as the words of *Rasul*? Preference is a far distant matter, how may I remain a believer if I consider both as equal, or even if I think so?

In fact your mistake is that you understand that we prefer expertise and understanding over the *hadith* of *Rasul* or give equal status to both, though it is not truth. The truth is that the correctness of the relation of a narration to *Rasul* (SAW) itself is under consideration. In your view it is necessary to accept every narration as a *hadith* of *Rasul* if *hadith* scholars declare its chain of narration as authentic. But in our view it is not necessary. We do not consider the correctness of the chain of narration as the only necessary reason to consider the *hadith* as correct. In our view the correctness of the chain of narrations is not the only way of knowing about the correctness of a *hadith*, but it is one of those ways which tell about a narration that it is most probably the *hadith* of *Rasul*. We also consider necessary to look into the text of the narration, to keep in view of the understanding of religion we have developed as a result of the overall knowledge of the Quran and *hadith*. Also, we consider necessary to look into the proven *sunnah* as reached to us with strong sources and which is related to the subject of the particular narration under consideration. In addition to it, there are other aspects also, without thinking on which we do not consider proper to relate any *hadith* to *Rasul* (SAW). Thus the difference among us is not on the point whether the *hadith* of *Rasul* and the opinion of an expert

have equal status or not. The difference is as to whether in matters of rejection or acceptance of narrations and inference of religious commands, the opinion of a *muhaddith* as regards to the chain of narrations and the opinion of an expert (*mujtahid*) as regards *Darayat* are equal in status or not, or whose opinion has more weight among the two? If anybody prefers one to the other in this connection does not commit a sin like the one who gives equal weight to both. But to make him a sinner you blame unnecessarily that he considers the opinion of an expert preferable to the *hadith* even after accepting it the *hadith* of *Rasul*, even though the fact is that even the thought of this type cannot find a place in the heart of a believer.

I have discussed different aspects of weakness in the bases on which the *muhaddithin* decide about a *hadith* to be correct, wrong or weak etc. Please tell me if those aspects of weakness are found in the method of *hadith* or not? If they are present, then why you people so strongly exert us to believe in the opinions of *hadith* experts. We have not claimed *hadith* experts as totally unreliable, nor can we ever think of it. In contrast to it, in the investigation of *hadith* we consider necessary first of all to know about its status as regards the authenticity of report. In this matter we give it full weight according to the status of the *hadith* expert when he has reported it in his book. But in the light of weaknesses in the science of *hadith* discussed above we do not consider necessary to rely only on the chain of narration and accept every *hadith* reported as correct according to this science, as the *hadith* of *Rasul*. You may not favour our opinion as we do not. But as a result of this difference of opinion at least you should not blame us for the crime that we have not committed.

## Some Questions about the *Hadith*

One of the readers of "*Tarjumanul Quran*" writes to us as follows:

"I felt great pleasure after reading your scholarly paper published in "*Tarjumanul Quran*" in response to the rejecters of *hadith*. Allah may reward you best. It will be useful to scholars in general and the readers of "*Tarjumanul Quran*" in particular, if you enlighten us more in this connection on the following aspects.

(1) *Rasulullah* (SAW) provided a necessary requirement for the protection of Quran by saying, "do not write from me except the Quran". The companions of the prophet (SAW) were commanded to recite and memorize the Quran as it was revealed, to which they were used to. Despite this the difference in pronunciation occurred which was cured in the period of *Hadrat* Uthman (RA) by his order. It means that the *hadith* cannot be as secured as the Quran is, particularly in a situation that their collection and criticism through different sources began only after the trial (فتنه) of the battle of *jamal* and *siffin* while the investigations on the chains of narration, narrators and subject of *hadith* was very difficult.

(2) There are many narrations about the words and actions of the prophet which should have been of the status of being continuous. Among the *hadiths* of action, for example about the quality and structure of prayer, reason requires that there should not be any difference while the prophet (SAW) said, "pray! As you observe me praying". At least in the *Haramain Sharifain* a large number of people has been observing it continuously in every period, five times throughout the day and night. But the difference of opinion which occurred among expert

Imams from the beginning about raising, suspending<sup>1</sup> holding<sup>2</sup> hands and saying *aamin* with whispering or loud sound etc. lessen the importance of continuity (تواتر), the status of *tawatur* in words becomes even lower, what to say about single man's news.

(3) No question to the fact that the holy life of the prophet (SAW) gives us lesson in our active life. So long as there was no satisfactory arrangement for the collection of *hadith*, Muslims living away from the two great dwellings (Makkah and Madinah) obtained prophet's model from the Quran. When *hadrat* Aayisha was asked about the prophet's moral she said, "His moral was just the Quran". Thus the Quran is a good source of knowing about Islamic moral and life. In this period also there are only few people who know about the life of prophet (SAW) correctly and in detail. But the followers of shari'ah in general know about the principles and the pillars, and this was the main objective in fact.

Above are the doubts of those who reject *hadith* as evidence, which if removed will be useful. However, I believe in the following ayah of the Quran and also in the authentic *hadith*".

مَا آتَاكُمُ الرَّسُولُ فَخُذُوهُ وَمَا نَهَاكُمْ عَنْهُ فَانْتَهُوا

"So take what the Messenger assigns to you and deny yourselves that which he withholds from you" (Al-Hashr: 7)

There are many other objections raised by the rejecters of *hadith* other than those you have pointed to. But dealing with all those particulars individually will only lengthen the discussion; and it is unnecessary too. Fact is that the opinion of a man entirely depends on his viewpoint. When he looks at any problem from differing point of view he finds all evidence to differ. When he

<sup>1</sup> To pray with hands suspended as *shi'ahs* do.

<sup>2</sup> To pray with hands held together as do the *sunnis*.

looks at the problem from favouring point of view he finds all evidences to favour. But when a person looks at a problem with blank mind only in search of truth, both differing and favouring points come into limelight and then he brings out a balanced view after comparing between the two types of evidences. That is why those who, as influenced by enemies attacks and narrations of careless *ulama*, have become anxious and dissatisfied with *hadiths* when look at this literature they find evidence after evidence against the reasonability of *hadith*. In contrast to it those who have been nurtured within the old traditionalist cover accept everything presented to them in the name of the prophet (SAW) without bothering about if it is weak or even fabricated. In my view both of these viewpoints are wrong, and when the viewpoints are wrong, whatever has been seen with these viewpoints is also wrong. Those are wrong who consider all *hadiths* wrong as such as also those who consider all *hadiths* as correct. Those people are not on the right path, who differentiate not between the Quran and *hadith* as also those who do not believe in the reasonability of *hadiths*. Correct way is somewhere in between the two extremes and the point in between cannot be seen so long as the viewer does not slide from the extreme points towards the midway. Thus the correct way is to attack the extreme groups directly, dispel them from their positions and drag towards the middle line rather than entangle in the discussion on particular points.

However, as you wish to throw some light on the problems you have pointed to, I give my opinion in short.

(1) This view is quite correct that *hadiths* are not as protected as the Quran is. But beyond this it is not correct to suppose that they are not at all protected and no word or action of *Rasul* (SAW) has reached us in correct form.



No doubt that there have been great difficulties in search of the methods of narration and the history of narrators, also differences among the *hadith* scholars have occurred in this connection, but the history of this art witnesses that the *hadith* scholars have shown perfect labour in their research and worked so hard in this direction that there was no possibility of doing more by a man. The treasure they have gathered as a result of their labour is in our custody today and the differences among them are also present with all evidences and witnesses. If anybody looks at this treasure with investigative skill it is not difficult for him even after 1300 years to know what the prophet (SAW) said and what not, what did he do and what not, and what is the status of a narration related to him with regard to its correctness and reasonability. But this fact is irrefutable that the kind of authentic and reliable treasure of knowledge the Quran is the *hadith* is not. Therefore, the real measure of truth should be the Quran. We shall certainly reject anything against the words or spirit of Quran and its being against the Quran will be an explicit proof of the fact that it is exactly not from the prophet (SAW). And anything which is according to the teachings of Quran or which is an explanation of the Quran or a detail of commands not against the words or spirit of the Quran<sup>1</sup>, and we know about its high probability through the methods of narration and reason (*darayat*), then we shall necessarily accept it and prefer to our rational interpretation and opinion.

(2) Apparently it seems quite correct that the *hadiths* related to sayings or actions of *Rasul* should gain

---

<sup>1</sup> It is to be noted that being against the Quran and being something extra are two different things. Some people do not keep this difference in sight and declare in the *hadith* those things also against the Quran which provide additional details to the summary (اجمال) of the Quran. You will find comprehensive discussion on this topic in the forthcoming essay.

the status of continuity (تواتر) if there are many people to see and hear them; there should be no differences. But everybody can understand after little thought that the event observed or the speech listened by a large number of persons when narrated or acted by them, they cannot be as united as not to differ least from each other. Unity among all will be found in the important parts of that event or speech but there will be enough differences in unimportant parts and these differences will never be evidence to that the event did not occur at all. For example I deliver a speech today and thousands of people listen to it. After few hours, not after few months ask the audience what the speaker said? You will observe that all of them will not be same in reproducing the subject of speech. Someone will tell about a part, the other one will speak about the other portion; someone will produce my speech in his own words, some more talented man will understand me well and produce a summary of my words. A weak minded person will not be able to represent me well. One having good memory will reproduce most part of my speech word by word; the other person having weak memory will repeat my words incorrectly. Now, looking at this difference if anybody says that I did not speak at all or my speech was reproduced wrong altogether, then he will not be correct. In contrast to it if all narrations are collected it will be known that everybody is united in the fact that I delivered a speech at that place and time, many people were present and this was the topic of speech. Then the parts of speech found similar in words or meaning will be considered more authentic and collected together to form an authentic speech. Those parts in which every narrator is different will be considered comparatively less reliable but calling them fabricated or wrong will not be allowed so long as

they are not against the spirit of the speech or there is no such material which shades them with doubt, such as being different from reliable parts of the speech or being against the correct information already available about the opinions, language and temperament of the speaker.

The same is the situation about the *hadiths* about the actions of *Rasul*. You have presented the example of prayer. I also answer keeping this example in mind. It is unanimously proven by continuity of narrations in words and actions of *Rasul* that he offered prayer five times in a day, it was congregational, and his followers stood behind him in rows and followed his actions. He used to stand facing towards *Ka'ba*, began the prayer by saying *Allahu Akbar* (Allah is great). Prayer was composed of standing, bowing, prostrating and sitting; every part had this and this posture. Thus narrations about all the important parts of prayer are unanimous and there continuous action on them from the period of the prophet till date. As for those parts like raising and holding hands etc. where there is difference in narratives never means that all narratives about prayer are wrong; it only means that the people saw the *Rasul* doing them in different ways at different times. Because these things do not have much importance in prayer which is not much affected by doing or not doing these actions, and because the *Rasul* was to define *shari'ah* he did whatever he liked at different times. But as no one except the *Rasul* was to define *shari'ah*, his duty was to follow not to define *shari'ah*, so every observer did according to his observation and taught everyone to do the same. The Imams who came later tried by meshing the narratives to know which of the narratives are more correct and authentic? Obviously the difference was possible in them and it actually occurred. Someone considered a narrative more authentic and the other one

found satisfaction in another. But this difference has no importance. It is never an evidence to that there was at all no continuity in narratives ---of words or actions ---- about the method of offering prayer by the prophet (SAW).

(3) The third question is the result of not understanding correctly the relationship between the Holy Quran and the *hadith* of *Rasul*. The Quran has given greatest importance to *tawhid* (Unity) and it is full of its details. We need not search it outside the Quran and in *hadith* we find nothing additional on this subject. After it come the moral teachings. Most of the moral principles have been detailed in the Quran, but obviously the morals are not related to words as much as they belong to the model of actions. Therefore, Allah has presented his messenger as perfect role model of morality. And *Rasulullah* (SAW) has explained all the moral teachings of the Quran with his actions, advices, wise teaching, practice, and through cleaning of hearts. Thus if anybody says, leaving aside the model of *Rasul*, that the Quran is enough for us in fact deprives himself of a great blessing. Moreover, in fact he considers the act of Allah in vain'--- that He sent a *Rasul* with the revelation of the Book and said that Our messenger will not only read to you Our words but also clean your hearts. He will teach you the Book and wisdom and his life will be a good role model in all matters.

As for the commands, there is often the description of general laws and details have been left in most of the cases. The prophet (SAW) introduced these commands in different matters of life and expressed the details of his words and actions. In some of these details there is no space for our expert views (اجتهاد). We are duty bound to follow the proven actions of the prophet (SAW). For example the commands related to *Ibadaat* and their details may be utilized in deriving principles and thereby making

inferences to come at particulars. For example the civil laws of prophet's time and some of the details tell us about the spirit of Islam. If this spirit settles in our heart and soul we shall be able to think in all matters of life like a Muslim's mentality and insight, look at the world problems of knowledge and action with Islamic point of view and finally establish an opinion that a Muslim should establish. Now it must have become clear how important is the knowledge of *hadith* with the knowledge of the Quran to be a perfect and strong Muslim? If it is said that an ordinary Muslim can live as a Muslim without the knowledge of *hadith*, I will say that it is not evidence to that the knowledge of *hadith* is unnecessary. And if it is then the same argument may be carried to say that the knowledge of Quran is unnecessary, because an ordinary Muslim also has very little knowledge of the Quran and yet he follows the commands of *shari'ah* in his life. The truth is that the ordinary people were neither standard Muslims in the period of the messenger (SAW) nor they could find this status later on. The standard Muslims in that period as well as today are only those who are equipped with the knowledge of the Quran and *hadith* and in whose veins and muscles settled the knowledge of the Quran and the model of the life of *Rasulullah* (SAW). Remaining Muslims were the followers of those people in that period as well as today. In the period of the prophet (SAW), the companions who were close to the prophet and gained more knowledge and training under his guidance were considered higher in standard. As compared to these companions, those who were not close to the prophet and could not be benefitted directly by his teachings were not preferred in knowledge and action. No doubt, both were Muslims but the difference in the status of both can never be overlooked.

**Tajumanul Quran: Rabiul Awwal, 1353 A.H.; July, 1934 C.E.**

## The Quran and The *Sunnah* of the Prophet (SAW)

One of our friends says:

"I have been continuously studying your articles related to the importance of *hadith*. I belong neither to that group of extreme opponents of *hatiths* that I would reject the words of *Rasul*, nor I am ready to blindly follow the traditions. I request you about these two principal problems to satisfy me and my friends:

(1) Whether the Quran is enough for salvation or not? If it is enough then why the details of prayer etc. which are extra should be considered primarily essentials?

Moreover, it to be thought that the other pillars of Islam (fasting, *zakat*, *hajj*) which are to be offered once in a year or life have been discussed in much details in the Quran. But why does it not discuss about the prayer which has to be offered five times a day?

(2) A. Are the traditions not the cause of Muslim's deterioration?

B. A nation which has scattered and which is having different orders cannot grow so long as there is no unity in it on one single order. Do you hope for a single order among Muslims despite accepting the traditions? My faith is that today the Muslims can find salvation only through unity, synchronization and the unity of the *millat*. What solution would you present for this unity in principle?

The questions you have raised are not so intricate that you could not have solved them by yourself after little thought. My articles you have referred to also have answers to some of these questions. However, if you are feeling some problem and your friends too, I discuss them in short.

(1) The Quran is enough for “guidance” not for “salvation”. Its purpose is to tell about the way of correct thought and action and in this guidance it is certainly enough. But for salvation simply the reading of the Quran is not enough. But it is necessary for it to walk with pure intention on the way it tells, keep same faith and belief which it has taught and act according to the same law whose principles have been laid in the Quran.

(2) The concept that the Quran is enough for guidance is also generally understood wrongly. When we claim about a book that it is enough for any subject of knowledge or art we generally mean that all the fundamentals of that art or knowledge have been covered in it. But it never means that whoever is able to read the words of the book will comprehend all the matters discussed in the book and only after studying this book he will gain such expertise that he will be able to make use of it in practical life. The book as such may be perfect in itself but to understand it is necessary on the other side that the student should have a particular level of ability. Moreover an expert teacher should also be present who should not only explain the meaning of the book but also train the student through experiment and exercise those details of the art which are neither fully present in the book nor by simply reading them a man can comprehend them fully. The same is the case of the Holy Quran. It is enough for guidance in the sense that it has that correct knowledge in the light of which man can walk on the right path and all those principles have been discussed in it on which Allah’s selected religion stands. But two things are required for making use of it. One is that the student should have pure intention and fulfill the basic qualification for understanding the Quran. Second requirement is that of an expert teacher who may explain

the ayaat of the book of God, tell their correct meaning, demonstrate by himself how to act on the commands and establish a systematic order by applying the laws in practical life. First requirement is related to the individual self of a person. The other requirement has been fulfilled by Allah Himself. The messenger (SAW) was sent with the book to meet the requirement of an expert of the field. Whatever he told as a teacher and the training he provided was from God as the Quran is. Calling it other than Quran is not correct. Whoever rejects its needfulness and considers the Quran enough in the sense that the guidance of *Rasulullah* (SAW) in knowledge and action is not needful to understand and act according to the Quran, he in fact claims that it revelation was enough and---- Allah save us----God sent in vain a messenger with it.

(3) You ask, "Why the details of prayer which are other than Quran should be considered first order duties?" Our answer is that calling the details of prayer etc. as told by the messenger (SAW) is wrong at all. If any expert physician explains any principle of medicine to the students through his experiments you cannot exclude it from field of medicine. A professor who explains the problem of Euclid through different kinds of figures you cannot call it non Euclidean. In every book of principles related to any field of knowledge only the principal and important problems are discussed and practical details are left for the teacher. It is because if a thing which can be told by the teacher within minutes through practical instructions is described in words it will consume pages and yet it will be difficult for students to act exactly according to the description. Moreover, the distortion of literary beauty and perfect precision is extra. This wise rule which the ordinary people keep in their fields of knowledge and arts you want that the wise of the wisest



who revealed the Quran should have neglected. You expect that Allah Ta'ala should have given the tables of prayer times, detailed the number and structure of raka'ts, postures of bowing, prostration, standing and sitting or should have provided pictorial figure of prayer on the facing page as some of the current books have. Then He should have written everything recited in the prayer from the very beginning to the end. Then He should have written about all those particular problems which are needed by a praying person. In this way at least two or three parts of the Quran would have been devoted to the topic of prayer. Similarly two or three parts were consumed for detailing the problems of fasting, *hajj* and *zakat* each. Moreover, the other matters of shari'ah which comprehend nearly all aspects of life would have been discussed in the book with all details. Had it been done, no doubt your wish would have been accomplished that none of the problems of shari'ah should be "other than the Quran", but in this way the Quran would have become equal to the size of Encyclopedia Britannica and all those benefits would have perished which have been achieved by keeping it a short book of principles.

(4) You also admit that the details of prayer, fasting and other pillars of Islam have not been discussed in the Wise Quran in details. But only their obligatory status has been stressed and severally repeated and at some places hints have also been given over their practicalities which cannot be termed as practical details. Now the question is who should decide about their details? Should it be left for each one to decide and act freely according to his thinking ability? There would have been no similarity even in prayers between two Muslims in this situation nor was any harmony present among Muslims in the actions on other pillars of Islam. The dispersion in nation you are

mourning for today is because of differences in few orders. However, millions of Muslims are united within the orders. But if everybody was free to decide the practical details of the commands of Quran, there would have been no order at all among the followers of Islam. The thing which has made these different individuals a nation is none other than the harmony and unity of belief and action and it is known that in the establishment of a collective system the unity of action is far more effective than the unity of belief. It is because man is the follower of senses and only sensual forms can influence his senses; the unity and harmony of these forms create in him the sense of society and collectivity. Thus the necessary consequence of leaving methods of action on the discretion of individuals was that Muslims could never become a nation simply through the unity in belief and doctrine.

When it is known that unity of action is indispensable for national unity and integrity and it is also known that Allah *Ta'ala* has not given in the Quran those details which could provide unity, then please tell who else other than *Rasulullah* (SAW) has the right to determine the methods of action according to the Quran? Which way the ummah could jointly follow other than this? To whom, other than him the Muslim *ummah* would accept as prime commander to jointly imitate and obey? This is only the due to the blessings of prophet's teaching that today for more than 1400 years Muslims are offering prayer in one form, perform pilgrimage in one way and fast in same period and similar way. The difference is only in parts, that too not because each Muslim considers himself free to chose any way but because each group considers bound in the light of knowledge to follow the way of the prophet (SAW) in that particular matter. As for the leadership

(*Imamat*) of the prophet (SAW) and consideration of his *sunnah* as obligatory to imitate, with the exception of countable few persons, entire *ummah* is united and the national union of Muslims depends on this unity.

(5) You please give a second thought on the Quran and see, where in it are the details of fasting, *hajj* and *zakat*? For *zakat* even this has not been told how much of it is to be paid out of what and what is its course? The directions for *hajj* and fasting, which in your view are details are even briefer than those for prayer. If you will look a little deeply you will know that as a rule entire emphasis lies in the Quran on teaching the belief system as it is the foundation of religion (*deen*). In case of prayers, morals and dealings, only the principles and important problems have been discussed and the details have been left for the prophet (SAW).

(6) The cause of Muslims' fall and deterioration is not the traditions. These are the lust, ignorant grouping, foolishness of making branches more important than principles, the habit of exaggerating their own whims in comparison to the book of Allah and the *sunnah* of Rasul and fondness of making newer and newer inventions. There can be no mischief because of mere difference in traditions if the above mentioned evils are absent. Traditions are either weak or strong or there may be any kind of difference in them, their origin is after all in the persona of the prophet (SAW) and the followers of these traditions are united in considering the prophet as their guide. Moreover, the differences in traditions cause differences only in branches, the principle are there in the book of God which is above traditions and common to all Muslims. Thus if Muslims feel with good intention that they are all the followers of Allah's book and prophet's *sunnah* and the principle of *deen* are common among

them, they can become united even if they continue to follow different methods in the branch issues. But in absence of this sense and feeling the difference cannot be cured even if entire literature and office of traditions is burnt into ashes. There is such a satan in the *nafs* of man which never commits to error in making even the Quran as the instrument of war.

(7) In what sense do you want "one order?" If your purpose is that there should be no difference in branches, you will fail to achieve it so long as the nature of human beings does not alter. It is not possible with nature of man that at least two persons will have exactly same viewpoint. Therefore, an ideal order without any difference at all cannot occur. Yes, if you take by "an order" as based on the unity in principles, then the book of God and the *sunnah* of His *Rasul* created similar order which can be establish in every period provided that the Muslims could understand the difference in the principles and the branches and learn to distinguish between the two.

**Tarjumanul Quran: Sha'ban 1353 A.H.; November, 1934**

## Objections to a *Hadith* and their Solution

One of the readers of "*Tarjumanul Quran*" writes:

"I studied a *hadith* described in "*Tajridul Bukhari*" written by Hussain bin Mubarak (d. 900 A.H.) on page 81 of Urdu version translated by Feerozuddin and published from Lahore. The *hadith* is as follows:

Narrated by *Hadrat* Anas that *Rasulullah* (SAW) visited his holy wives within a time in the day and night and they were eleven (according to another narration they were nine). *Hadrat* Anas was asked did he have the power over all. He said, "We used to say that he has been given the power of thirty men"

I am hopeful to you sir; please enlighten us about the authenticity of the above *hadith*. Is it a fact that the prophet (SAW) became close to all his wives within a time? And if he did, how *Hadrat* Anas came to know about it? Did *Hudoor* (SAW) told about it to *Hadrat* Anas? Did any one of the holy wives open this secret? Did *Hadrat* Anas know every time about this happening? Or did *Hadrat* Anas himself keep busy in investigating about this closeness. After all what was the need of *Hudoor* (SAW) to be so hurried while his turns were fixed? Or, was the health and strength of *Hudoor* not affected by this intensity?

This *hadith* has been quoted in *Sahih Bukhari* at two places, once in the Book of Bathing (*Kitab al-Ghusl*) under the chapter "*When a person attempted to a woman and then repeated, and the one who visited to his wives with only one bath*". The other quote is found in the Book of Marriage (*Kitab al-Nikah*) under the chapter "*One who moved within his wives but with one bath*". The words of *hadith* in the first chapter are as follows:

كان النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم يدور على نساؤه في  
الساعة الواحدة من الليل والنهار وهن إحدى عشرة قال  
قلت لانس او كان يطيقه؟ قال كنا نتحدث انه اعطى قوة  
ثلاثين-

*"The prophet (SAW) used to go to his wives within a time during the day and night. Qatadah says, 'I asked Anas if he had this much of power?' Anas said, 'We used to say among us that he has been provided with the power of 30 men.'"*

In the second chapter Sa'eed bin Abi 'Aroob quotes Qatadah and conveys the following *hadith* of *Hadrat* Anas.

ان النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم كان يطوف على نساؤه في  
الليلة الواحدة وله يومئذ تسع نسوة-

*"The prophet (SAW) used to visit his wives within one night and they were nine in those days."*

Purpose of quoting both *hadiths* is to tell if a person makes contact with a woman more than once at a time, bathing is not necessary after every attempt. One bath will be sufficient for all. As far as the talk about the number of wives being nine or eleven or the power of *Hudoor* is concerned it is only by the way. That is why *Imam* Bukhari has written at both places in the description of the chapter as 'one bath' (غسل واحد).

Nasa'i has also reported from Anas two narrations of similar material in the chapter '*visiting wives before bath*'. In one of them it is, 'he visited his wives within a night and took one bath' while in the other the words are, 'He used to visit his wives with one bath'. It means that, he visited his wives and took bath thereafter only once.

Abu Da'ud has reported a *hadith* in the chapter '*Repetition of attempting to a woman*' in which it is said, 'he visited his wives one day and took only one bath'.

After this he has reported the following *hadith* from Abu Rafi'.

طاف ذات يوم على نسائه يغتسل عند هذا وعند هذا.

قال فقلت يا رسول الله الاتجعله غسلا واحدا. قال هذا

ازكى واطيب واظهر.

*Once Hudoor visited his wives and took a separate bath in each house. I asked, 'Ya Rasulullah! Why do you not take only one bath?' He said, 'this is a more clean and pure way'.*

Then he has transmitted a *hadith* from Hadrat Abu Sa'eed Khudri as follows:

إِذَا أَتَى أَحَدُكُمْ أَهْلَهُ ثُمَّ بَدَأَ لَهُ أَنْ يُعَاوِدَ فَلْيَتَوَضَّأْ بَيْنَهُمَا وَضُوءً.

*"If anybody of you visits your wife and makes mind to repeat, he should make wudu between the two attempts'.*

Tirmidi has also quoted this *hadith* in the "*Chapters of Cleanliness*". Comparing between these *hadiths* we come to the point that the cleaner way is to take separate bath in case anybody visits his wife more than once. If it is not possible at least *wudu* should be made between the intervals. But it is not necessary; the condition of cleanliness is fulfilled if one bath is taken after the last attempt.

Now keep in mind the following things before giving any place to doubt in heart.

The prophet (SAW) took birth in a nation which was just in the beginning stage of culture and civilization. Allah did not give him the responsibility of only to correct their opinions but he had to correct their life also; make them human being, teach them moral sincerity, clean social relations, cultured civilization, pious dealings and good manners. This objective could not be reached by simple preaching, advisement, speech and communication. It was not possible within a short period of 23 years to raise the status of entire nation from wildness to the

highest level of culture simply by giving them some advisements by inviting them sometimes. It was necessary for this to provide them a perfect model of humanity in his life and give them full chance to see this model and mold their lives accordingly. He did the same.

It was his great sacrifice that he made public every aspect of his life for teaching the whole nation. He did not keep secret even those matters of his life which nobody can be eager to make public. But he allowed people in general to come and look into every aspect of my life, keep an eye on every matter to see how I do act? No one other than the prophet can make such a great sacrifice, and no other person can dare to put his whole life for open inspection. Only this fact is enough for proving the prophet-hood of this wonderful person. Who else has lived in this world for complete 23 years with his life in the sight a large number of people every time in all situations, so that hundreds and thousands of people are busy investigating his and each every action? He is being examined at his home during his behaviour with wives and children and yet a single dot could not be seen on his character after this much of investigation. In contrast it is proved that whatever he taught others his own life was a perfect model of this teaching; he never repelled little from highest standard of justice, piety, truth and purity. Above all, those who observed him most closely were his most fascinated disciples.

It was however, a passing remark. We were discussing that *Rasulullah* (SAW) had allowed for the education of people to look into his life in matters --- walking, sitting, standing, sleeping, waking, house hold life, prayers, obedience and dealings ----- look his actions in all matters, listen to those who have observed him, ask those who know or directly to him and try to mold their



own life according to that ideal life. He also allowed his wives to tell all, women and men, about his behaviour that they could see in seclusion from others so that the life of people could be adorned in private as in public with ornaments of culture, sincerity, cleanliness and purity. Because of this important purpose even his wives did not hesitate to tell about those private matters of his life which nobody likes to be known by others. Allah *Ta'ala* also gave these noble women the status of the "Mothers of Believers" to facilitate ease in this education; they were prohibited for the *ummah* as a whole so they may freely talk to their sons and keep telling about the activities of their spiritual father (SAW) to imitate and follow him, to know about allowed (حلال) and not allowed (حرام), pure and impure, and to distinguish between sincere and insincere. Moreover, though *hudoor* was very shameful yet he raised all curtains of shame for the sake of education and, himself gave instructions to his spiritual sons and daughters, allowed them to ask anything and provided opportunity to see his activities and know about pure, cultured and sincere life.

One of the departments of this education was the cleanliness and purity of dress and body. Arabs were after all wild people, what do you observe about those nations who claim to have reached the horizon of culture and civilization? Not knowing about cleaning mouth after eating, careless of cleaning body after evacuation, urinated while standing and put on the buttons of the trousers, stood from the commode and plunged into the tub. Moreover, in the matter of interaction between men and women they have reached such a level of insincerity, shamelessness and filthiness that cannot be even discussed among noble gathering. When this is the level of these modern nations one can guess what would have been the

level of people who were just in the beginning stage of culture. When the prophet (SAW) came, he not only purified their hearts but also taught them methods of cleaning body and cloths. He developed in them the fine sense of purity, created a distinction between filth and cleanness, and grafted by his advisement and actions in their men and women the habit of civility, cleanliness, purity and sanitation after finishing filthy, hateful, insincere and ugly methods of living. For this it was unavoidable that *Hudoor* (SAW) should uncover before them to some extent his private life so that what they do not or could not ask or he himself does not get chance to tell, the people could know through observation. In a way his self had become an institute of teaching. He taught not only by words, but his whole life from all angles had become a centre of learning for the neighbouring population.

When people read in *hadith* books the problems related to intercourse, monthly cycle, post parturition period and details of many other such problems by the tongue of his wives, other gent and lady companions or by the prophet himself they just object that these are shameless things. But if they think a little they will come to know that it was a great sacrifice that the prophet (SAW) agreed to do only for the benefit of his *ummah*. The prophet whose shyness was so high-leveled that he did not ever look his life partner undressed, who did not like to live naked even in loneliness allowed his wives to make public most secret parts of his private life only to educate *ummah* for cleanliness and sincerity, and provided chance to his closest servant to be aware of his secrets and convey them to people. Was it an ordinary sacrifice? And it was the result of this sacrifice that not only Arabs but millions of world Muslims could decorate their private

lives with a system of the cleanliness of body and dress, purity of manners, and fineness in matters of sex. Otherwise, if these departments were left for personal willingness and distinction our behaviour in secret matters of life would have been very close to animals because even today there is in the world no arrangement of educating and training humanity in these departments of life.

This was in response to the questions raised by the learned questioner on the awareness of *Hadrat* Anas about the secrets of the prophet (SAW). Now we concentrate on the other part of the question.

The *hadiths* we have quoted in the beginning have the words like *kaana yatoofu* (كان يطوف), *kaana yadooru* (كان يدور) or *tafa* (طاف). All these words literally mean “to move around”. Message is that sometimes the prophet (SAW) visited to all of his wives in one night. His rule was that he lived with anyone of his wives each night according to turn, but sometimes he also visited all the wives in a night. The narrator is eye witness only to the fact that the prophet visited each of his wives. Visiting all the wives does not necessarily mean to be in sex with all. This is only a guess of the narrator. The narrator is *hadrat* Anas and in view of his age this type of guess does not seem much surprising. He began serving the prophet (SAW) at the age of 10 years and the prophet (SAW) died when he was 20 years old. The guess of such a young boy in these matters is not quite reliable. When young boys look a husband going to his wife their minds unintentionally transfer towards sex. They cannot judge that a mature man’s relation with his wife is not always that of the sex.

Moreover, it is also to be kept in mind that one of his wives, Zainab bint Khuzaima got married with the prophet

in 3 A.H. and died only after two or three months. Second wife, *Hadrat* Sauda because of old age had offered her turn to *Hadrat* Ayisha. Excluding these two *Hudoor* had only three wives in 4 A.H. One more was added in 5 A.H. and another in 6 A.H. Three more wives entered the harem of the prophet (SAW) in 7 A.H. In this way the prophet had eight wives towards the end of his age with whom his involvement in sex might be guessed. This also expresses the weakness of the opinion expressed about involving in sex with 9 or 11 wives.

Now, the least that can be said is that the prophet (SAW) in the last three years of his age attempted in one night with his 8 wives. Even if it is true then in the case of a healthy and strong person who has passed his life in piety and not deteriorated his body strength by evil thoughts and actions there is nothing abnormal in it. This can be wondering in the case of those persons who have misused their powers in youth and have become old before the approach of old age. *Hudoor* (SAW) was a perfect man; all powers in him were finely balanced. Perfection of sexual power in a man equipped with high leveled mind and brain is a medical reality that no one can deny. Moreover, he protected this power in such a manner that he passed entire youth with a single wife without least imbalance in his piety. When he was in fifties he challenged his enemies with the permission of God that I have lived with you for long (لقد لبثت فيكم عمرا), tell if anybody has seen any mistake in my character. But nobody among those who were thirsty of his blood could claim O, Muhammad! That weakness was found in you at that time. Thus, seeing on the one side his piety with perfect sexual power we can say that his attempt over so many women in his last period of life was not beyond nature, and on the other side knowing about his perfect

holiness despite this power we can judge how strong he was in controlling himself.

As for the words of *Hadrat* Anas that he was bestowed with the power of 30 or 40 men were not the words of the prophet, nor is it an authentic statement. *Hadrat* Anas himself says, "we used to say among ourselves so and so". Obviously he was young in that period and would be talking among the friends of his age. People in youth generally give more importance to sexual power. Moreover, *Hadrat* Anas was the youth of an Arab society of that period in which the power of manhood was supposed to be a character of proud. It was but quite natural if he discussed this matter of proud about his beloved Master from whom he was greatly influenced also. It always happens with great personalities that the people who are highly influenced by these extraordinary persons begin to believe in them to have qualities above normal humanity. But such believes are not as important as to erect buildings of evidences based on them.

*Hadrat* Anas (RA) said only that *Hudoor* had the power of 30 or 40 men. Some other narrations quoted by Abu Na'eem, Ahamd and Nasa'i go even beyond this and claim that these 40 men are not the men of this world, they are the men of paradise each one of whom will be having the power of 100 men. Thus the power of *Hudoor* (SAW) was calculated to be  $40 \times 100 = 4000$  men. But all these things are based on good faith and have been said by people who assumed extra-human qualities in the prophet as a result of being highly influenced by his prestige. They considered it a matter of pride with good intention. These things have been transmitted as such in an article written by one of the learned persons of our period whom we perfectly respect for his knowledge and piety. He says that as the prophet (SAW) had the power of 4000 men, he had

the right of keeping 16000 wives in his *harem*, yet he confined himself to 11 only. Though it was said in good faith, but whoever might have said it with whatever intention, we cannot refrain ourselves saying that the assessment of the sexual power of *Hudoor* (SAW) is grim even to sound reason, what to say about presenting it as an argument against the enemies of Islam, skeptics and confused persons. Should we expect that presenting *Hudoor* (SAW) before them in the colour of *Kanahaiyya Ji* and Hindu gods would create the light of faith in their hearts? Objections raised by the enemies on our prophet (SAW) for having good number of wives could be falsified by many strong arguments. Choosing for this kind of arguments in place of others is certainly apologetic, especially in a period when the enemies of *ulama* highlight and exaggerate their little mistakes and going beyond them begin to attack religious knowledge itself.

**Tarijumanul Quran: Zee Qa'dah, 1354 A.H.; February, 1936 C.E.**